1	BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE FINANCE AND ASSEMBLY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEES	
2	AND ABBEMBET WATS AND MEANS COMMITTEES	
3	JOINT LEGISLATIVE HEARING In the Matter of the	
4	2010-2011 EXECUTIVE BUDGET ON HIGHER EDUCATION	
5		
6	Hearing Room B Legislative Office Bldg.	
7	Albany, New York	
8	January 27, 2010 10:05 a.m.	
9	PRESIDING:	
10	Senator Carl Kruger Chair, Senate Finance Committee	
11	Assemblyman Herman D. Farrell, Jr.	
12	Chair, Assembly Ways & Means Committee	
13	PRESENT:	
14	Senator Liz Krueger Vice Chair, Senate Finance Committee	
15	Senator John A. DeFrancisco	
16	Senate Finance Committee (RM)	
17	Assemblyman James P. Hayes Assembly Ways & Means Committee (RM)	
18	Senator Toby Stavisky	
19	Chair, Senate Committee on Higher Education	
20	Assemblywoman Deborah J. Glick Chair, Assembly Committee on Higher	
21	Education	
22	Senator Velmanatte Montgomery	
23	Assemblyman Steven Englebright	
24	Assemblyman Michael J. Cusick	

1	2010-2011 Executive Budget
2	Higher Education 1-27-10
3	PRESENT: (Continued)
4	Assemblywoman Donna Lupardo
5	Assemblyman Philip M. Boyle
6	Senator Elizabeth O'C. Little
7	Assemblyman Mike Spano
8	Assemblywoman Earlene Hooper
9	Assemblyman Joel M. Miller
10	Senator Brian Foley
11	Assemblyman Charles Lavine
12	Assemblyman Keith Wright
13	Assemblyman Jack Quinn
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	LIST OF SPEAKERS
2	STATEMENT
3	
4	Nancy L. Zimpher
5	State University of New York
6	Matthew Goldstein
7	Chancellor City University of New York
8	77
9	Elsa M. Magee
10	NYS Higher Education Services Corporation (HESC)
11	David M. Steiner
12	Commissioner NYS Department of Education
13	NYS Department of Education
14	Andrew Pallotta
15	Executive vr, Nibol
16	Dr. Phillip H. Smith 286 President, UUP
17	riesident, our
18	Dr. Barbara Bowen
19	riesident, roc
20	Laura L. Anglin
21	Commission on Independent Colleges & Universities
22	Peter Barry 322
23	Vice President New York State University
24	Police Officers Union

1	LIST OF SPEAKERS	
2		STATEMENTS
3	Aquina Nolan	330
4		
5		
6	Patrick Krug	336
7		
8		
9		2.51
10	Cory Provost, Chairperson	351
11		
12	Clement James Tatiana Benjamin	
13	CUNY University Student Senate	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2.4		

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Good morning,
ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the
third set of statutory hearings concerning
our FY 2010-2011 State Budget.

Pursuant to the State Constitution and the Legislative Law, the fiscal committees of the State Legislature are authorized to hold hearings on the Executive proposal.

Today's hearings will be limited to a discussion on the Governor's proposed budget for the City University of New York, the State University of New York, that part of the State Education Department dealing with higher education, the Higher Education Services Corporation, and the Office of Science, Technology and Academic Research.

A period following the presentations will be allowed for questions from the chairs of the fiscal committees as well as my colleagues in the Legislature.

We will begin today's hearing with testimony from the chancellor of the State University, Nancy Zimpher.

Good morning.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Good morning. 1 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Introduce your 2 members? 3 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Oh, introduce my 4 5 members, that's a good point. Thank you. To my son -- he always gives the good 6 directions. To my immediate right is our vice chair 8 9 of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Liz 10 Krueger. Immediately thereafter is Senator John DeFrancisco, Senator Toby Stavisky, and 11 Senator Brian Foley. 12 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: On my side we have 13 with us Assemblywoman Glick, chair of the 14 Higher Education Committee, we have 15 Assemblyman Cusick, Assemblyman Englebright, 16 and Assemblyman Hayes. Oh, and 17 Assemblywoman Donna Lupardo. 18 Assemblyman Hayes will introduce his 19 2.0 members. ASSEMBLYMAN HAYES: Thank you, 21 Mr. Chairman. We're joined on our side this 22 morning by Assemblyman Joel Miller, 23 Assemblyman Boyle, and Assemblyman Quinn. 24

1 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Good morning.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Chancellor, for the purposes of brevity, I know that you have a long statement and I know we're going to have many questions. So to the extent that you can refer to them and summarize points so we can go back to them, it would be greatly appreciated.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you.

Good morning. As noted, I'm Nancy
Zimpher, the chancellor of the State
University of New York. And I want to thank
you, Chairman Kruger and Vice Chairwoman
Krueger and Chairperson Farrell. I
certainly want to acknowledge Senator
Stavisky and Assemblywoman Glick, to other
Senate and Assembly members and to this
audience, in order to share, on behalf of
SUNY, the 2010-2011 Executive Budget and the
implications thereof.

I have had a gracious welcome to

New York, and I want to thank you all for
that. I come today in partnership with

Chancellor Matt Goldstein, and I want to offer this public thank-you to Matthew for being so industrious in the immediate care and feeding of his new partner. Matt will be here, and I just want you to know that we come together today and we're very proud of that partnership.

I'm joined today by SUNY Senior Vice
Chancellor Monica Rimai; she is the chief
operating officer of the State University of
New York. And I have many members of my
leadership team in the audience.

I've been here for a short eight months, but it's been a very, very busy time. I'm a teacher by training and a teacher-educator. I've spent many years at Ohio State University as a dean of the College of Education there. I was formerly the chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and, most recently, the president of the University of Cincinnati.

Every day, in every way, SUNY reflects the fundamental principles of public higher education, access to excellent education for

all, research that tackles the most critical challenges facing society in the 21st century, and transformational community engagement. In my many years of public higher education, these are the three riveting principles of our work.

Many of you know and in fact many of you joined me on my 64-campus tour, completed within the first 95 days of my tenure -- 7,361 car miles, or truck miles, I could say. I learned a great deal on this tour and, most significantly, listened very carefully to the issues and opportunities that present themselves to SUNY and to the State of New York.

I feel an immense responsibility today to carry a critical message to you about New York's future. In a time of tremendous challenge, I believe we find ourselves in a unique moment where we can create unprecedented opportunities for the people of this state. And that's why I'm going to spend the vast majority of my testimony describing SUNY's vision for the future, the

strategic plan we're developing that puts

this vision into place, and the legislative

proposal that will make it possible: The

Public Higher Education Empowerment and

Innovation Act.

I will discuss the impact on SUNY of recent budget actions and the current Executive Budget and then come back to how SUNY will be a key partner with you in driving New York's economic recovery.

So here's what SUNY brings to the equation. We have an enrollment high of 464,981 students registered and enrolled this fall, 25,000 more students than last year. Our community college enrollments grew this year by 10 percent. And as you know, community colleges make up over 52 percent of SUNY's enrollments. And our enrollment also includes over 96,000 minority students, accounting for 21 percent of our student population. And we enroll 1.2 million students in continuing education, which says that we serve over 1.6 million New Yorkers. We have a big

share in college-bound New York State high school graduates, well above 40 percent.

And our academic medical centers
educate over 7,000 health professionals
annually, employ over 25,000 state
residents, and it should be noted that
80 percent of the enrollees in our medical
schools are residents of the State of New
York.

We also have secured annually over a billion dollars in direct and competitive external grants and, over five years counting, 17,000 research-funded jobs for the state.

All of these resources put us in a position to address two of the most significant issues facing the nation and New York.

First let me talk about what we call
the leaky education pipeline. I'm talking
about a pipeline of educating young people
from birth through career, where now
30 percent of our high school students are
not graduating from high school and half are

2 ar 3 th

not graduating if you speak of minorities and children in poverty. And so many of those who do graduate from high school come to college underprepared for college work. Forty-eight percent of our students are in remedial classes in our community colleges and 17 percent in our four-year schools.

I believe that SUNY has the resources, the reach, and the talent to partner with our early childhood educators, our K-12 educators to better prepare our teachers, increase our graduation rates, and make sure that every student is prepared for college and career.

And, of course, second, SUNY's role in job creation, the ability and the responsibility to help create jobs for New York's 21st-century economy. By spinning off the discoveries from our research labs into mainstream demands for new products, services, and healthcare outcomes, SUNY has already created high-quality, stable new jobs for this great state. But we can and must do much, much

more.

If we have the freedom to partner with the private sector and to direct our procurement activity, SUNY could employ new faculty and staff in university facilities and drive new construction projects. By unleashing SUNY's existing resources, SUNY could literally create 10,000 new jobs in the next five years, such that all those new graduates produced by a renewed education pipeline will find quality jobs to live and prosper right here in New York.

So we are driving down two parallel tracks to make this happen. The first is SUNY's systemic strategic plan, which is now under construction, and the second is the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act, once implemented. You could say that the strategic plan is the road map and the legislation is our license to drive. Together, these two steps are critical for SUNY to reach its ability to meet its goals and serve this state.

So let me say a word about the

stra
chan
Boar
plan
SUNY

strategic plan. When I was appointed chancellor, I did so with a charge by the Board of Trustees to engage in a strategic plan that would, quite frankly, transform SUNY and drive economic prosperity for the State of New York. But as original management guru Peter Drucker once said, "The best way to predict the future is to create it." And in many respects, that's exactly what SUNY is doing.

The campus tour provided me with invaluable perspective on SUNY and the state. And now, through this process, we are working on seven themes that are going to drive our commitment, in sustainability, in energy, in creating quality communities, in driving arts and culture, in enhancing the education pipeline, in increasing our commitment to health affairs, to globalization and diversity in the world.

These themes converge on one big idea for a big system of public higher education.

In short, SUNY can be the key driver of New York's economic recovery and enhanced

quality of life in our communities.

So let me say what the power of innovation can do to drive this strategic plan. I'm talking, of course, about the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act. We like to call it the SUNY/CUNY Empowerment and Innovation Act because we are both, as systems, joined together make this act a reality. And that includes our work in community colleges, technical schools, comprehensive colleges, and of course our research centers and academic health centers.

This act uses high-impact, zero-cost solutions to create jobs, build the foundation for tomorrow's economy and strengthen public higher education, all the while building New York's revenue base. In terms of impact, here's the critical headline. We estimate that over the next ten years these reforms will help SUNY campuses create more than 2200 faculty positions, 7800 campus jobs, will allow us to invest over \$8.5 billion in capital

О

_

construction, which will support over 65,000 construction and industry jobs. It would be impossible to overstate the magnitude of this proposal, which is truly a milestone in SUNY's 60-year history.

There are five major policies in this SUNY/CUNY Empowerment and Innovation Act. I will do them quickly.

First, it streamlines business

practices, eliminating the pre-audit of

university expenditures and contracts, but

still subjecting those activities to

post-audit. I might point out that New York

is one of only four states in the nation

that still requires this pre-audit state, so

the competition is well ahead of us.

Secondly, the act helps our campuses become more entrepreneurial, allowing the University to enter into land-lease agreements, public/private partnerships, and the joint ventures -- and, I might add, with the approval of a newly created State University Asset Maximization Review Board. We might shorten that title, but it is

1 ov 2 I

oversight of the kind of public transparency

I believe you request and will hold us

responsible to.

It will allow us to create stronger and

better partnership with the private sector, build and diversify our revenue streams, and be more effective in cost-containment. And in the text we elaborate on some of our best models of public/private partnerships.

Perhaps the most well-known is the Nanoscale Science and Engineering Center in the Albany nanotech complex.

The third and fourth elements of this act are about tuition policy and financial independence. Of course, it all comes down to our students, who are New York's future. That's why this SUNY/CUNY Empowerment and Innovation Act sets up a funding model that protects student tuition and fees and other campus-generated funds from other uses, such as deficit reduction, by moving those revenues off-budget and depositing them with the University. It authorizes the SUNY/CUNY boards of trustees to implement rational and

differential tuition, adopts out-of-state 1 maximum enrollment percentages, invests all 2 tuition fees and other campus-generated 3 revenues, including hospital fees, with the 4 University by bringing them off-budget, and 5 repeals the tuition-sharing statute adopted in last year's budget, properly restoring 7

of the University.

б

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This legislation will enable the creation of fair, equitable, and responsible tuition planning. I hope you remember those "Fair" because tuition will be terms. predictable, so that our students and their families can plan for the costs of their education. But also "equitable," using a Higher Education Price Index which actually drives costs, so that we're matching tuition to real costs, and it is tuned to market perspectives, so that we're in a market-driven economy. And, finally, "responsible" because we will be consultative, particularly with our student body, as the Board of Trustees frames our

student tuition dollars back into the hands

tuition policy. Let me reiterate: Fair
equitable, and responsible.

And finally, and I hope this warms your heart, this bill calls for transparency and accountability. You will have oversight over our use and our allocation of state funds. The revenue we derive from tuition, fees and other sources and activities, expenditures for personal and nonpersonal services, programs and activities funded by tuition revenue derived from differential tuition, our enrollment planning and any such other information that you and the budget director might request.

Furthermore, going off-budget with tuition revenue makes it possible to show you, our students, and their families that their tuition dollars are being invested in their institutions and to know how the money is being spent.

While these are the highlights of a groundbreaking piece of legislation, in the long run these reforms will allow SUNY and CUNY to more effectively and transparently

invest resources in support of our mission 1 and sustained economic growth for the State of New York.

> Now, in the midst of this fiscal crisis, let's look at the impact of the current economic environment on SUNY. I turn quickly to past budget cuts. I take very seriously the promise I made to change the way business is done at the State University. Of course, upon arriving here I was immediately confronted with the midyear Deficit Reduction Plan, which reduced state funding to SUNY campuses by \$90 million. took the initiative to deal with this reduction in a new way.

> I convened a budget task force made up of our presidents, provosts, vice presidents for finance and research. And for the first time in recent history, SUNY looked to its campus leaders for advice on how to best allocate this reduction -- I might add, a lesson I learned from being a two-term campus president, that our presidents have to be involved directly in our budget

2

3

5

6

reductions and budget allocations.

This allowed for a bottom-up, not top-down, process of meeting the needs of our campuses -- and not strictly formulaically, but by what would best serve our campuses. This is part of pushing the reset button with you. We are transforming the State University of New York and, most importantly, our relationship with you.

But the fact remains that the \$90 million midyear reduction brings the total of state aid cuts to SUNY to \$420 million over the past two fiscal years. Given the fact that we have added an additional 25,000 students over the past year, there is even more pressure on our campuses to do more with less. A \$424 million budget reduction over two fiscal years, 25,000 new students to serve.

There is a litary of reductions we have made; I will mention only a few. Five hundred ninety-six positions have been or are being reduced at state-operated campuses, 2.3 percent of our workforce. And

at the same time, enrollment at those campuses grew by 3700 students. On our comprehensive colleges, 9 percent of the workforce has been eliminated or vacated, while their enrollment grew 11 percent. And campuses are going into their reserves to make ends meet. We have used or are planning to use 25 percent of those reserves, with many of our campuses using 50 percent or more of their reserves and three campuses using 60 percent or more.

We project \$147 million in reserves to be tapped this year across the SUNY system. And once those funds are gone, they will never be seen again. And it will, in fact, limit our ability to project going forward. Nonetheless, a step we knew we had to take.

And now to the Executive Budget impact, reducing state support to the University by \$326 million from what the SUNY Board of Trustees requested for the upcoming fiscal year. The Executive Budget makes permanent the \$90 million Deficit Reduction Plan cut. It further reduces state support by

\$117 million for SUNY's state-operated campuses and \$18 million for the SUNY colleges at Cornell and Alfred, and this includes a payroll savings target of \$33 million which must be negotiated with the unions.

The Executive Budget carries forward \$130 per FTE base aid reduction in the 2009-2010 deficit reduction plan for our community colleges and further reduces base aid by an additional \$285 for full-time-equivalent student. The proposed budget also eliminates the charge-back formula for the Fashion Institute of Technology for baccalaureate and master's degree students.

And for our hospitals, the Executive
Budget keeps funding for our three hospitals
flat year to year, which means the hospitals
will have to cover \$99 million in state
negotiated collective bargaining agreements.
And as you know, SUNY hospital funding will
also be negatively funded by the recommended
changes in Medicaid funding.

.

With regard to our capital budget, the Executive Budget recommends additional capital funding of \$550 million for critical maintenance capital projects on state-operated campuses and \$24 million for the state's 50 percent share for community college projects. The state's continued capital investments through the multi-year capital budget are elevating SUNY's facilities to a state of good repair while providing a significant economic benefit to the state.

We do understand that there are tough choices to be made. But we must acknowledge that these are significant cuts, especially when added to the reductions over the prior years. And if they cannot be moderated, they will seriously affect the ability of our institutions to serve students, families, and our local communities. As you continue budget negotiations, we are hopeful that fair consideration will be given to supporting all sectors of public higher education.

_

All of this has been a long way of saying that I want to be your partner and that the State University of New York wants to be your partner in driving New York's economic recovery. That is why we're so enthusiastic about the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act.

I've been impressed by the positive and continuing news coverage and editorial support for these proposals received from Buffalo to Long Island, New York City, Syracuse, Binghamton, and dozens of other communities across the state. People are recognizing that this is a big idea whose time has come. And given the state's fiscal crisis, this legislation provides a way to protect the SUNY campus in your community from the winds of economic change.

By supporting this act, you will be positioning SUNY to be your strategic partner in the revitalization of the state's economy. And unequivocally, this is SUNY's top priority. Give us the reasonable reforms and independence the Empowerment and

Innovation Act provides, and in turn we will give New York unprecedented opportunities, jobs, and hope.

I read the New York Times before I came to New York; I read it more closely now. the magazine section in February of '09 when times were really, really tough, the big article was called "The Big Fix." And I quote, as a closer: "More educated people are healthier, live longer, and of course make more money. Countries that educate more of their citizens tend to grow faster than similar countries that do not. same is true of states and regions within this country. Crucially, the income gains tend to come after the education gains. There is really no mystery to why education would be the lifeblood of economic growth. On the most basic level, education helps people figure out how to make objects and accomplish tasks more efficiently. allows companies to make complex products that the rest of the world wants to buy, and thus creates high-wage jobs. Education

24

1

2

1	helps a society leverage every other
2	investment it makes, be it in medicine,
3	transportation, or alternative energy.
4	Education, educating more people and
5	educating them better, appears to be the
6	best single bet that a society can make."
7	Thank you, and I welcome your
8	questions.
9	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you,
10	Chancellor.
11	Assemblyman Farrell?
12	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you. We
13	have been joined by Assemblyman Lavine,
14	Assemblyman Spano, Assemblyman Keith Wright,
15	and in the audience is Assemblyman Pretlow
16	and Assemblyman Mark Schroeder.
17	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you,
18	Assemblyman Farrell.
19	We have a number of questions, starting
20	with the chair of our Higher Education
21	Committee, Senator Toby Stavisky.
22	SENATOR STAVISKY: Thank you, and
23	welcome to Albany.
24	CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you.

SENATOR STAVISKY: I have a number of questions which I'd like to hear you tell us. For example, if you don't mind, differential tuition means that departments can charge different rates of tuition without any limits, aside from the various boards that will have an advisory role. Can you address that issue? Particularly as it will affect students who may not have the means to attend some of these programs.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you,

Senator Stavisky, and for your leadership

and your early contact upon my arrival in

New York.

I would like to frame both setting tuition and differential tuition in a larger context. SUNY has been absent a comprehensive tuition and enrollment plan for as long as anybody can remember. Which means that we have 64 campuses all enrolling students at different levels for different programs, but we have not been able -- and we intend to fix this -- to calibrate where to grow our enrollments and what markets

we're trying serve and now what costs of tuition and whether or not we should differentiate tuition either by program, by degree level, or by campus.

So our intent is to put forward a comprehensive enrollment and tuition management process through our Board of Trustees -- and as I said, consultative with our students, and in turn, they represent their family needs. We're going to use an index called the HEPI, the Higher Education Price Index, which is widely used by higher education across the country.

We have a rolling average we are permitted to cap tuition 10 percent or under. I think we in no way intend to take that to its limit.

And we frame differential tuition
within the same context, keeping in mind
that our students of need need access to TAP
funding. And if and as we pierce the TAP
ceiling, we are committed to close that gap.
Of course, we got a little surprise in the
\$75 cut to the TAP funds, so now we're

committed to close that \$75 gap and anything above that.

But I guess what I want to summarize by saying is we think policy will protect, be fair and equitable and protect our students. We think our commitment to TAP will protect our students. And we think that planning to meet the market demands of the State of New York will help us keep our tuition policy in check.

And I think one example that you might be most interested in is nursing. Nursing is a high-demand field. It would suggest that you could increase tuitions differentially for nursing because of the market demand. But in fact, many nurses serve in high-need areas that don't reap the kind of salaries a high tuition might suggest. So we're going to be very careful to protect access while looking very strategically at what markets might allow us to increase specific tuition.

SENATOR STAVISKY: My question, though, was how are you going to limit not

the cap that's been placed on the 1 institutions, but on the programs. CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well -- on the 3 differential tuition programs. That's correct. SENATOR STAVISKY: 5 I'm talking about the programs. CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: On the programs. I think it is in the spirit of using that index to guide our differential tuition as 9 well. 10 And Monica may want to add to that. 11 VICE CHANCELLOR RIMAI: Well, I think 12 the statute makes it very clear that with 13 regard to proposals for differential 14 tuition, that those would have to come 15 before the Board of Trustees, that they 16 would not be subject to exclusive 17 decision-making at the campus level. 18 And I think the statute also makes it 19 very clear that in coming forward with such 20 a proposal, whether it's the campus level or 21 the department or programmatic level, that 22 the campus would have to justify that 23

proposal based upon market factors, some

fairness analysis.

b

1.0

1.1.

One might look to, for example, what's happening with health support at the national level to get a sense of whether or not a proposed increase at a differential level, a programmatic level, would be appropriate.

And perhaps one of the strongest moderators of potential increase on a differential basis is the market. One thing that we know for sure, based upon looking across the country, is that tuition is very sensitive to market factors. And one has to be very careful not to price oneself out of a particular market, because students have options.

Now, I think it's also critical, and I think the chancellor has made this very clear, that all of this needs to be looked at in terms of a comprehensive tuition policy which will take many, many elements into consideration.

SENATOR STAVISKY: On January 21st, the Chronicle of Higher Education had an

article, the headline said "The cost of college is a big worry of freshmen in national survey."

1.4

1.6

How can we assist the students at the community-college level -- and you were there, I was there when President Obama came to Hudson Valley Community College. How is this going to affect the accessibility, with the cut in base aid and other cuts to the community college? How are we going to allay the students' fears that they can't afford higher education, especially a two-year degree program?

think one aspect of the entire national tuition picture is the pride with which the State of New York can point to the levels of our tuition relative to other institutions across the country. And certainly the value one gets in a SUNY and CUNY education, where you have great quality mixed with affordability. So I think we have to start by saying we've done for years a great job at keeping college affordable in public

1 hi

1.5

higher education in New York.

But I think, having spent a long time working with high schools and junior high schools and helping students plan for college, we're not still doing what we need to do to get a student and his or her family ready for planning for tuition, even if tuition in New York is more affordable than elsewhere. Students do have to be planful.

And quite frankly, we're going to have to advocate, over time, for a relook at TAP. I think everybody knows this is a key driver for access. And things having changed since the TAP ceiling was set. And we want to be your partner in doing that.

But in the interim, we're going to have to be more planful. Quite frankly, public universities across the country do a lot of fundraising to help create scholarships for aid and merit. As you know, SUNY has not been in the fundraising game as long as some of these big Midwestern public universities that I'm familiar with. But I can tell you, we're going to increase our development and

fundraising activities, and our highest priority will be student scholarships.

And I would add to that -- and

President Obama and Secretary Duncan have

talked about this a lot -- there are many

barriers to students accessing college, not

the least of which is the forms and

information and tax background of the

families who are seeking aid. I think we

can really be helpful there too.

SENATOR STAVISKY: You mentioned in your testimony the elimination in the Governor's proposal of the charge-back formula, the changes in the charge-back formula for FIT.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Right.

SENATOR STAVISKY: And that I find very troubling. It's close to a \$9 million cost, an \$8.8 million cost to FIT. What can we do to help?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Senator, I'm

very glad you mentioned that. I think we

don't quite know what the thought was, where

that came from. FIT has been such a magnet

for advanced degrees. Not to have the 1 charge-back capacity is really crippling. SENATOR STAVISKY: And all of the 3 graduates have jobs. It's an amazing institution. 5 They will really CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: be glad you asked this. I was supposed to 7 speak at their convocation this morning; the budget hearings trumped that. But they'll 9 be pleased with your concern. 10 SENATOR STAVISKY: One last question. 11 You indicate on page 9 of your 12 13 testimony that you have eliminated 596 14 positions at state-operated campuses. about at the SUNY administrative 15 headquarters? Has there been a comparable 16 reduction? Because there's a lot of 17 duplication in terms of job titles both at 18 the SUNY Central and at the various 64 19 campus locations. 20 CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Senator 21 Stavisky -- and any of the others of you who 22 are interested -- you have to know that one 23

of my highest priorities administratively is

to create checks and balances around what is best done at SUNY Central and what is best done on our campuses and how we can facilitate the two.

I do know that there have been considerable vacancies held at SUNY Central. And while we have made some new additions to my leadership team, which you would certainly understand, they have not eclipsed, by any means, the reductions that we have made.

And I hope, for your interest and curiosity, by the end of the year to be able to show you the whole template of SUNY Central. I think you deserve to know and I need to know who and how Central is serving our 64 campuses. So I really welcome that. And I hope you hear in this a reset of our relationship.

SENATOR STAVISKY: Absolutely.

Absolutely. And we thank you for your candor and for your concern.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you, Senator 1 Stavisky. 2 Assemblyman Farrell? 3 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblywoman Glick. 5 ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Thank you, Chancellor. You've given us a lot of 7 information. And I know that we have a lot of people on the panel, so I will try to hit 9 just a few points, although there is much 10 more that I think will deserve discussion as 11 we go forward. 12 For a long time there's been this 13 notion somehow that our tuition and our 14 tuition policy has kept us at the low end of 15 public institutions and that we give very 16 good value but that there's room for us to 17 raise tuition in proportion to the kind of 18 value we're offering. 19 Just last week it popped up on the 20 computer while I was looking in Yahoo, my 21 account, for email, the Kiplinger's 100 Best 22

Values in Public Colleges. And they had a

very interesting chart which included their

23

2

3

5

_

7

Ŗ

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

own ranking, which, you know, is always -they probably throw in where the people
enjoy going to the schools.

So I never really look at the ranking per se, but they had the enrollment, the admission rate, the student-faculty ratio, the four- and six-year graduation rates -which I think was interesting, because there's always this notion that somehow people aren't graduating in four years and that's some sort of sin when we know many people are working and have family commitments. And so it seems a little more realistic to actually have both of those comparisons in state costs. Which, to the extent that they had the background information, seemed to be a combination of tuition, fees -- which we never talk about, how the fees are in there -- and room and And they had it as total in-state. board. They also had out-of-state, but I'm not that interested in that at the moment.

And I was fascinated to see that University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,

which we would view as a preeminent institution, their in-state cost was \$15,300, rounding off. Just a few steps down, ranking SUNY Binghamton very high on the chart, which is terrific, it indicated that their total in-state cost was \$18,200. The student-faculty ratio at UNC was 14, and the student-faculty ratio at SUNY Binghamton was 20.

So, you know, I went through this and looked a little bit, and it was great that I think 10 SUNY schools were on this list.

But schools like University of Washington was at 17.6; Geneseo was at 17.1. So it was interesting that there has been this notion that we are totally at the low end when in fact there does seem to be, with some of the really, you know, excellent schools, we're sort of actually right in the mix.

So in terms of, particularly in this economy, the market forces that we are talking about, I think there needs to be some understanding of the -- there are two, as I understand it, there's more than one

б

HEPI. There's a national, and then there are regionals. And the regionals have varying curves, so -- aside from the fact that the HEPI is dramatically, the slope on the HEPI is dramatically higher than the CPI.

So in discussing where we are in a rational tuition policy, how those determinations will be made, the use of the HEPI would have provided a 9.5 percent increase this year based on the formula. That's a fairly significant jump. The guess would be next year would be closer to 11.

So I guess I'm trying to get a handle on how do you see this as maintaining affordability for New York students if we're going to be potentially following an index that is fairly high and we are currently in the middle range of tuition costs.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, first of all, Assemblywoman Glick, I want to thank you for your support and immediate attention to my coming to New York.

I want to add to everyone here that

Assemblywoman Glick and Senator Stavisky
were on many of the campus tours, either
when I was there or before I was there or
after, and a number of other legislators as

I think your interest in tuition is historic, profound, and very important. I think you're doing your homework at every turn. I want you to know that we are adding to the equation an intense study of tuition by the Rockefeller Institute, which I think has been a reliable source of checks and balances for statewide economic policy for a long time.

to our peer markets. As Vice Chancellor Rimai has noted, we do ourselves no favors if we separate ourselves from our peer doctoral institutions. And that's obviously the comparison between North Carolina and Binghamton or Stony Brook or whatever; those are doctoral institution comparisons.

We thought we chose, and I believe we did, the most reasonable of the HEPI

 well.

ㄷ

indexes. But we can also show you, on a regular basis, regional indexes.

Our key to managing tuition that is fair, equitable, and responsible is to be transparent with you and to be able to present a logic for in-state tuition.

And, you know, it's been suggested that there might be room for growth in out-state tuition. We're finding that's not true for our doctoral institutions. They're very much with their peers, and we would do ourselves a disservice if we somehow hiked our doctoral -- but we look at comprehensive universities differently.

So I think the immediate answer -- and Monica may want to make a more technical response -- is that we expect to report to you our policies and procedures, and you will be our checks and balances. In some respects that doesn't exactly change our relationship in radical ways, it just puts us in the driver's seat to present the plan and for you to understand what we're doing and why.

The Kiplinger index, I'm not particularly familiar with it, but --

VICE CHANCELLOR RIMAI: Well, one of questions that I have about that report -- and I may be confusing it with another, but one of the factors one has to look at in determining the appropriateness of a particular tuition level and how to keep that down is, on the flip side, what is the amount of state support that comes to that particular institution. Because that is probably the biggest factor that helps us control tuition, since those are the two revenue streams that help drive most of our institutions.

But it's a fair point, and it's something that, frankly, is a helpful data point when we look at developing a comprehensive tuition policy. And, you know, your question is an important one, because I think it really allows us to examine the power of taking a comprehensive approach to looking at tuition and enrollment management. And here's why.

19

20

21

22

23

24

I really believe -- I think the data bears this out -- that one cannot seek to increase investment in higher education, whether we're SUNY or any other place, based on one single factor. So in short, for example, we cannot solve our needs for greater revenue need streams for reinvestment on the backs of our students This is a multi-factored kind of alone. approach where we look at, as one factor, where do we sit in national averages in terms of our tuition. Why is that important? That's not important in and of itself -- by itself, it doesn't rationalize or justify a tuition increase -- but because it may suggest something about the market. And what the market will bear is an appropriate consideration.

But as important is affordability,
because there's this sweet spot, I really
think, between the size of your enrollment
and your tuition. And there's a point at
which those factors will cross, and you can
price yourself at a point where your

_

enrollment begins to decline such that you're just chasing your tail. On the flip side, increasing enrollment without careful attention to cost can actually decrease your revenue stream, because each additional student can actually drive up cost because they represent, you know, additional need for resource.

So it is the ability to look at all of these factors together that really allows us to develop a comprehensive, fair, equitable and responsible approach to where we put our tuition.

As important on the affordability side is the ability, then, to look at TAP or other sort of grant opportunities. If we have control in a comprehensive way, that we can take some portion of that tuition revenue and drive it back into grant support so that we are absolutely sure that we are maintaining affordability.

So, I mean, we could go on for hours about how these various elements interplay. But I think the point is that it is the

ability to look at all of these factors in a comprehensive way that makes this fair, responsible, and equitable.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: I appreciate that. And you're right, not only can we, we will go on for hours at some other point on this matter.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: We welcome that.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: And I'm glad you sort of foreshadowed the follow-up comment, which was they also included out-of-state. And in most of these instances, the out-of-state tuition roughly was twice the in-state. And that was not anywhere near the case with SUNY.

where you don't feel you have the ability to continue to attract out-of-state. But when we had, as some of our colleagues did, the experience of traveling with their kids to schools and seeing out-of-state people from Texas or wherever and saying, "Why are you here?" and having them say, "Well, your out-of-state tuition is cheaper than our

in-state tuition, "that represented a serious problem. At least a perception problem, if not a real problem.

Let me just ask a couple of other questions.

In your testimony, you talked about the great success that we're also proud of at Albany Nanotech. Which is obviously a terrific opportunity, not just here but now, with SUNY IT, I understand there's some discussions of collaborations and so forth, which is great.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Right.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Added value, totally wonderful. But that was actually created under the current structure that apparently the Empowerment and Innovation Act seems to suggest is totally unworkable and inflexible and difficult. And yet that was created with that in place.

So I'm wondering, if that was possible, why the sense is that future public/private partnerships that could be equally profitable on both sides is so daunting.

б

I wanted to

first, Assemblywoman Glick, just reiterate that the whole tuition discussion really will be informed by this Rockefeller report. That's precisely why we joined Comptroller DiNapoli to study this issue further. And I think that's really good precedent; when you raise issues or make suggestions about what we ought to do or ought not do, then we'd better get the facts. And I look forward to that report, and we will be sharing it with you.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER:

You know, I wasn't here when some, say, eight or nine years ago we started down the path of nanoscale science and engineering. I don't know how tortured this case study was. I do know that it has taken us a good year to begin to move on what would have been UB 2020 had we implemented some of these empowerments last year. And I think speed is a part of the dilemma. Speed and the roundabout that we take because we have certain limitations on public/private partnerships.

So I think this is sort of manifold.

First of all, when we engage in

conversations with business and industry,

our efficiency matters. I think this is an

underlying theme of the most recently issued

Business/Higher Education Task Force led by

President Skorten. We have to find more

nimble ways to deal with business and

industry because in that sector, speed

matters. We have never really been known

for speed -- not you, not us. But I think

we need to think that way.

Secondly, we don't want a roundabout.

We want to go directly, face in, to these public/private partnerships, not looking for, Well, we could do it if we'd go this way and that way, and taking 12 months to do something or two years to do something or the nine years I heard to get Nanoscale up and running.

We need five, ten Nanoscales for the State of New York to fully recover. We need to welcome Global Foundries with the kind of nimbleness and partnership and commitment

that we welcomed the creation of nanoscale.

So I think it does come down to process and our ability to be forthright in these partnerships. We are being asked to do that by business and industry, by the so-called Skorten Task Force. We are in some very interesting conversations with higher education presidents and business leaders today to begin to implement that task force. And the Legislature's and SUNY's and CUNY's contemporary way to deal with the business partnership has to be at the focus.

So I'm going to come back and say,
yeah, I think we got it done. I think it
was a labored and slow and burdensome
process. We love the result. We need to do
more of this, and we need to do it faster
and, frankly, more transparently.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: On that matter, how many contracts does SUNY, by campus, have for services, as we discussed earlier, for things like transcripts? There was the instance where on the screen it was apparently a SUNY Plattsburgh service to

receive transcripts for the purpose of maintaining a private scholarship. And it turned out that when it didn't work out smoothly, that SUNY Plattsburgh said, Well, you know, really that's a Chicago firm.

So how many contracts exist for those kind of things that people would naturally -- this is reminiscent of the preferred loan list for student finance loans. What's the situation, or don't you have a handle on it yet? Or does Monica know?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: First of all, I appreciate, Assemblywoman Glick -- it wasn't as if you didn't tell me you were going to ask this question. So for the three or four days that I've had to investigate, we still don't have our arms around it, but we will.

I think you have a right to know when we use outside vendors. And I think we'll find, I hope we'll find that this was limited and purposeful. But we have nothing to hide here. So we're chasing it. And we appreciate your oversight and monitoring,

and we will share this information with you when we retrieve it.

But I think it's reasonable to know what SUNY can do and provide for itself and when and why it contracts with other parties. And I think a part of the question was particularly out-of-state firms. So if we can contract and do our businesses in-state, we can increase New York's revenue base, which is our central challenge.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: In the interests of time, let me just ask one final question.

since you're going through this review on enrollment and how you can manage that and at the same time figure out what you can do to deal with any TAP reduction, how do you in the near term think that the TAP cuts are going to affect enrollment going forward? Do you think that it's going to have a major impact? And is there any plan or thought about what you might do to assist students who might find themselves short?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Assemblywoman

Я

O

1.6

Glick, the creation of the so-called SUNY
Budget Task Force -- which might not mean a
lot to you, but bringing our representative
presidents to the table to consider budget
decisions before they get allocated from
SUNY Plaza has been a breakthrough strategy
for us.

It was that presidents' task force that agreed that if we were to raise tuition enough such that it pierced the \$5,000 maximum TAP, we would make up the difference through our campus budgets. That figure is \$70. Just so you know, our tuition this coming fall will be \$5,070. Seventy dollars pierces the TAP ceiling. We were committed through the recommendations and approved by our Board of Trustees to close that gap ourselves.

We had not projected the additional \$75 in the Executive Budget to reduce TAP, and now we have to consider that a part of our cut. But I think you know, in principle, what we're going to do is provide for it. I have been advised that this is a very

slippery slope. I think you're familiar with slippery slopes: If our campuses can close the TAP shortfall this year, let them do it next year.

We cannot continue to do that. I join you in advocacy for reinstating or extending TAP funds, because we serve so many low-income students who desperately need that support.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: In closing, let me just say that there are a number of other questions which we will continue to discuss with you. And I appreciate the great seriousness with which you come before us.

But I will also say that I am dismayed, as I'm sure all of SUNY is, with the fact that over the many years the percentage of state support has diminished dramatically. And I don't think that is in any way appropriate. I think that if we going to have an investment plan for the state, the place you put it is in higher education. And we have been eroding that state support. And if we want to call it the State

University, we actually have to be willing to step up to the plate and increase that percentage of the support we provide.

But I also am mindful and hope that -and I'm sure you are -- that part of the
purpose of the State University was to
provide an alternative to the private system
that people could afford. And I'm
desperately concerned that using the HEPI
index and going to a differential tuition
situation will only, by market forces, drive
SUNY closer to privates and erode the
essential mission. So that's the tension
that we'll be working with.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Assemblywoman Glick, I so appreciate you're articulating the tension. SUNY is, at its core, a public institution. And I am proud to only have served public institutions in my entire career. SUNY is an incredible asset to the State of New York because it's a high-quality operation, it's affordable and accessible. And I join you in maintaining that commitment. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you, 2 Assemblywoman Glick.

I'm going to slide myself into this repertoire for a moment. Tonight, the State of the Union message, we're going to need something more than a smile and a speech to get us through these tough times. And I had for you a couple of questions -- maybe they're not all answerable at the moment, but I think it's something that we should take back as our collective homework assignment.

During the Deficit Reduction Plan, we rattled a tin cup -- in fact, we squashed a cup in trying to find dollars to close the gap and to make this year's fiscal budget work. And although many disagreed with the methodologies and the mechanisms that we used, at the end of the day we did close the gap.

We never had opportunity to address the dollars that are sitting in the research foundations at the State University. They seem to be elusive, and nobody really ever

has a real handle on how much money are sitting in those pots of money and how they can be used. Can you tell me how much money is sitting in the research foundations?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Senator, if you wanted a figure at the very moment, without my looking it up, I think the answer would be no.

But I think your question in general is to demystify, to the extent it has been mystified, the nature and purpose of the Research Foundation. And I have to tell you that this is a very high priority of mine.

I am currently newly the chairperson of the board of the Research Foundation. I took that position because I needed to make an immediate transition from interim leadership, but I intend to foster a review of the governance structure of the Research Foundation, which includes its operation and its management. Largely because of the sense of what goes on there, what are we doing there, why is it different from.

But I can tell you it is no different

from the very esteemed Research Foundation of the University of Wisconsin, where I served for five years, a remarkable organization that fed research for arguably one of the leading research universities in the country.

So I believe that essentially the funds are those funds earned and generated by our researchers from largely federal funding agencies, like NIH and NSF, which are then distributed for the use of the campuses because they're contracted with the federal government. So I think there's less mystification than there should be. I know there's a history. I know there are some stories that just won't die.

But I want to tell you, Senator, I will be a partner with you in unpacking whatever remaining questions there are.

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: That's all we can ask. Because at the end of the day, it's those kinds of dollars that may make this equation ultimately work.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Exactly.

1.1

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: When we look at the State University hospitals and the medical schools, the fact that there are practice plans in those institutions and those doctors are getting paid both from the University as well as from their practice plan, and also from their private practices and the research that goes on within those medical schools -- at the end of the day, Chancellor, you came to us not only with sterling credentials but a sterling reputation of no nonsense and the willingness and the desire to make this system one of the finest in the country. applaud you for that. We want to cooperate with you in doing it.

But at the same time, when we listen to the Governor's budget plan that calls for the privatization of the SUNY system, you know, it races serious concerns. I know it does to you, and I know it does to us as well.

So as we go forward with these hearings and as we go forward with the entire

tortured process of trying to put this budget together, understand that even among families there are arguments and even among families there are disagreements. But at the end of the day, it's our shared belief that the State University system with can reach new heights with your leadership and with our collective goodwill.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you, Senator. I want to say, having had a lot of national engagement in public higher education -- and private higher education, for that matter, because I work with a lot of presidents of private institutions -- I'm being invited to a one-day conversation of only 25 university presidents in the country. And I was interviewed yesterday to lead up to that conversation about the privatization of public higher education. Ι don't really like that term. I don't really believe that education is solely a private good. I believe it is a public good and that we do nation-building through public education.

But I believe that universities have to 1 do their part to help the condition which 2 has prohibited so many states from investing in public higher education the way they 4 ought to. So I will defy the slippery slope 5 of privatization -- don't like the term, won't use the term -- but I will say to you our strategic plan of economic revitalization and your implementation of 9 empowerment are a way to keep us standing as 10 a big public good and a big public entity. 11 And we don't want to drop to a mere 7 or 12 8 percent of public support, because it's 13 really not a publicly supported endeavor in 14 that regard. But we have to help each 15 That is my commitment. other. 16 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you very 17 much. 18 Senator Foley? 19 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Before we go 20 there, we've been joined by Assemblywoman 21 Earlene Hooper, deputy speaker. 22 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Senator Foley. 23

SENATOR FOLEY:

24

Thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman.

And, Chancellor, I want to thank you as well for your leadership and your enthusiasm that you've brought to your position. We've met several times on Long Island, along with Chairwoman Stavisky from the Higher Education Committee, and we've had some very good discussions about the future of higher education in that region of the state.

And sure, there are many things that we can discuss today, and obviously all this will require much more follow-up, but I want to just focus on a few areas: Tuition, TAP, land use at the campuses, capital construction, a little discussion of community colleges. And also I like the fact that there is an increase in resources for campuses to become more veteran-friendly, as veteran-friendly campuses are something that we'll strive to see happen.

But on the tuition front, you've been hearing a lot of concerns from a number of electeds here. And one of the areas I just

want to make a comment on, whether you want to discuss it now or even just think about it, is the issue of differential tuition.

One of the concerns that has been brought to my attention, and I've thought about it for quite some time as well, is if you have different tuition rates for different programs, will we then have students making decisions, some students make decisions upon the affordability of the program if there's a different tuition rate.

I think it's an important portion of what this state is about. Given that our state is one of the most diverse in this country, affordability is key for so many to, let's say, fully realize the dream of our country. And many find it very difficult financially to move forward if in fact these tuition rates increase to the point that some will be shut out of the program that they wish to be part of. So I want to just leave that with you.

With TAP funding, when you mentioned in

your comments about TAP funding that a portion of tuition revenues would flow to the TAP program in order to increase access for low- and middle-income students, what we need to have is a definition of "middle-income." Because what "middle-income" is in some regions of the state may not work in other regions.

And in high-cost areas of this state, particularly on Long Island, one of the concerns that I would have is that even if some of the tuition flows to, let's say, filling the coffers of the TAP program, will it still, let's say, shut out some families who may be above that so-called middle-income level but who are still having a difficult time to make ends meet.

There are portions of this state that are high-cost areas of the state, we've got both parents working, and they may not fit the classic title of middle-income -- and yet if there are these large increases in tuition over a period of time and TAP will not, let's say, reach that particular higher

middle-income level, I have concerns about that. So we have to look at what we mean by middle-income and what that definition is.

Prior to being a State Senator, I was a supervisor for Brookhaven Town. Land use is a big part of what town government is about. And when we speak about greater autonomy for our universities and the like, and taking some of that authority away from the legislative branch, you know, I have some real concerns about what would be realized by having that greater autonomy. The land use, what kind of activities would occur on those particular properties?

One of the things I've seen over a period of years, just to give you an example in our parks system, over the years there were efforts to commercialize some of our parks as far as advertising and the like.

One of the real concerns I would have -- and as much as we want to see a more robust public/private partnership, one of the real concerns I have is that we have to be very wary of commercializing our campuses. And I

would daresay that no doubt there are other parts of the country where they have this greater autonomy among campuses and the like, and less oversight by their legislative counterparts, that commercialization has happened.

And I would strongly suggest that there cannot just be a tangential connection between land use on these campuses, but there needs to be a direct connection between the mission of the college, the mission of the campus, and the kinds of developments that would occur on the campus. I just want to put that out there as well.

As far as the capital construction funds, I wanted to just ask this question of you for an answer. The Governor's proposal proposes to remove the SUNY University Construction Fund from the budget process. Could you give us your thoughts about that? By removing the SUNY Construction Fund from the budgetary process, how is that beneficial to SUNY and why do you see it as a better alternative than the current

practice where there is, again, far more robust legislative involvement and oversight as it relates to the appropriation of funds for construction projects throughout the SUNY system?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Senator Foley, that was a very comprehensive question. And it speaks to the comprehensive nature of the Empowerment and Innovation Act.

And I do agree that that act puts on the table in one package a number of different issues that would represent a change, an historic change in the way we do business -- with the critical connector being the accountability and transparency with which we do our business.

So in some respects we are trading who plays what role with a much improved system of accountability and transparency putting us together. So I just want everybody to keep in mind that in articulating that Empowerment and Innovation Act, there are checks and balances all the way through it.

So let us start with tuition and

differential tuition. It sort of is presented as if the way we've been doing it is okay and the way SUNY would do it might not be so. And yet when we were on our little press conference after the Governor's announcement of the Empowerment and Innovation Act for SUNY and CUNY, it was said that in fact we've been doing tuition policy perfectly wrong -- perfectly wrong. We raise tuition during the toughest of We do not raise tuition when we seem times. to have a better funds flow. That's not predictable, that's not equitable, and it's really not responsible.

And secondarily, we do something in

New York that I have to say, even though

I've only lived in two other states, is most

remarkable. We don't return the tuition to

the institutions where the students have

paid the tuition and need to be served by

the tuition.

And those things need to be corrected.

There are a lot of different ways to correct them, but I believe we've given a host of

2324

1

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

checks and balances to ensure that we are responsible, fair, and equitable.

Furthermore, I cannot tell you the commitment of SUNY to access. Not just, as you say, access as typically defined as low-income students who meet the Pell Grant description or the TAP description, but middle-income families that are struggling as well.

So we have, as a very high priority, need-based tuition support beyond what we do to feed the TAP. You and I know we're going to have to do this through fundraising and friend raising, because we don't have a pot of money to do that. But we are committed, and we will share data with you about precisely the condition of our middle-income students.

So I think it's a fair question, but I know we're going, per summary, over the shift in who's presenting these policies, but the connector for us is accountability and transparency. And in that respect, this is the new SUNY. I hope you hear that

today, perhaps if nothing else.

Land lease. There are so many examples of where I believe our partnerships with the private sector are obvious. We mentioned one today in nanoscale science and engineering. Then there are private initiatives that we could invite to use our land who might be wholly inappropriate. I think you called them the commercialization of our land. It doesn't connect with our mission, and it makes no sense to have them on state property.

The middle ground is things that on first blush might not look as obvious to our mission as I think they are. And the one example you've had experience dealing with is senior residence facilities on our campuses. This is becoming increasingly common amongst higher education institutions across the country. I don't know how you feel about this, but there are a lot of retirees in America who want to live near a campus, they want to take courses, they want to go to performing arts. They support with

their funds the continuation of our cultural outreach. They add dimensionality to the mind of an 18-year-old when you've got a very seasoned 60-year-old sitting in the class. We want these people on our campus, and we think we have a financially lucrative, revenue-generating way to serve them.

So I only ask that we really probe the proposals and we make sure it's not commercialization but mission-driven. And I really appreciate that question.

I think -- and Monica can correct me -the Construction Fund move is to protect it
from the vagaries of settling the operating
budget on the backs of a wonderful five-year
planning process for construction. In fact,
I have said so many times the reason our
construction fund works so well is because
it's on a five-year planning cycle. Our
operating budget seems to be on a 24/7
planning cycle. It changes regularly. You
can't plan that way.

So I think it really is about

protecting the Construction Fund from those vagaries. Correct me if I'm wrong.

VICE CHANCELLOR RIMAI: I think
that's true. I would note that the
Construction Fund does operate with a
greater level of sort of autonomy, if you
will, than the operating side.

The added benefit of having a single system for funding these two, both operating and the capital side of the house, is that we're going to get more efficiencies out of this. We can share personnel who manage both kinds of budgets. And that would frankly enable us to reduce the number of positions that we have by not having to replicate the system. So I think there's efficiencies to be gained by having a single process.

I do want to go back and just mention one thing. Whether we're talking about land use or public/private partnerships, this is not a bill designed to eliminate oversight.

And in fact, it makes it very clear that there is the creation of a board wherein the

Legislature would have representation that would approve these projects to make sure, for example, on the land use side that the proposed project is consistent with our mission. So I do think that's a critically important difference.

I couldn't agree with you more that with regard to comprehensive tuition policy, where we start creating that policy is with a whole bunch of definitions, starting with what is need-based, various levels of income, and how those fit into the picture. So I would imagine a series of guidelines that start with a glossary and that we would get lots of good feedback and use national standards for defining a lot of these.

And finally, with regard to the great concern about differential tuition, there's two important points here I think we need to make. The first is that everyone is assuming that we're going to use differential to increase tuition. And there's a real possibility that by integrating what we're calling the rational

or across-the-board increases with decisions based upon cost and reinvestment, in some areas we could actually decrease tuition.

What integrating a differential option with an across-the-board option really allows us to do is to spread tuition across programs, mindful of things like access, workforce development, all the issues around affordability, segregating portions of the revenue to help fund TAP -- all of these things come together to really allow us to take a hard, comprehensive look at how we set tuition.

And not just year over year. I think a question was asked about how do we address family concerns about how they're going to pay for education. And a really good way to do that is to develop policy that spans more than one year. Can you imagine if we had a five-year tuition policy that would allow families to be very planful? One of the other phenomena about this state is in addition to our policy being perfectly wrong in terms of timing of when those increases

1	come, those increases are really lumpy. In
2	other words, in one year we'll have those
3	astronomical increases, and then the next
4	year tuition is flat. And that makes it
5	very, very difficult for students and their
6	families to engage in meaningful, long-term
7	financial planning.
8	And I think that what this bill does is
9	allow us to address that issue in a very
10	comprehensive way.
11	SENATOR FOLEY: Thank you. Thank
12	you, Mr. Chairman.
13	CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you,
14	Senator.
15	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you, Senator
16	Foley.
17	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Hayes.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN HAYES: Thank you,
19	Mr. Chairman.
20	And, Chancellor, thank you for your
21	testimony. Good morning.
22	I have the privilege of representing
23	the North Campus of the University of
24	Buffalo, in Amherst. And as you know, there

1.5

is widespread support in both the education community, the business community, the community in general for the UB 2020 plan.

The concern that I think many in

Western New York have had over the years is
the seeming disconnect between the excellent
higher education opportunities at SUNY and
then, once we've invested all of this money
and time in our young students and in our
graduates, they all too often, after even
coming to the Buffalo or the SUNY system
from around the state, wind up without a job
opportunity. And so we've invested in our
most precious resource and then turn around
and watch them be exported to other places
in the country where there are more job
opportunities.

Can you tell me a little bit more about how you see this flexibility, this new ability to work with the private sector as it would relate specifically to graduates from SUNY in places like SUNY Buffalo, and finding jobs in the local community?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, first of

all, Assemblyman Hayes, I want to compliment
the Western New York contingent. Your
advocacy is persistent and obvious, and I
have been a principal of that advocacy at

many trips to Buffalo. So thank you for that. That's the kind of advocacy SUNY

7 needs, and I appreciate it.

That said, I think you've really given the rationale for this Empowerment and Innovation Act, because it is all about job creation. And we cannot retain our graduates if we don't have jobs for them, jobs that are in current demand and jobs we've never even thought of yet that are yet to be invented.

And the power of our public/private

partnerships is to attract more businesses

to the state with the promise that we can

fill their employment needs. Global

Foundries is a perfect example. So is

Nanoscale. Nanoscale is here and in high

need of clean lab technicians; Hudson Valley

Community College is providing them. And

the same will be true with the medical

growth in downtown Buffalo and serving
Western New York. This will create jobs.
The universities of Buffalo and Buff State
and Erie and Niagara will feed those jobs.

And whereas the city guru Richard

Florida wrote a book about the creative

class choosing to live first by place and
then by job, I think that's changed. I

don't think people are going to place

without jobs.

And let me say one more thing, because

I hope you know that this kind of

partnership with private industry is -- and

of course our research and the

commercialization of our technologies, often

called tech transfer, is a way that we

translate research into jobs. That's what

we do best. And we do it not only at our

research centers and medical schools, but I

think there's a contribution made by our

comprehensive colleges, technical schools

and community colleges.

So by having our strategic plan sort of rivetted upon all of this, we're going to

make that job creation quotient -- we said

at least 10,000 jobs over the next five

I bring one more example to the State of New York which I personally am very passionate about. It's typically called cooperative education. And what it means is that while a student is still in college, he or she has real live work-integrated experience at local companies within the state. Students are paid, so that means our local companies have to put up a little chump change. These companies learn to identify and help make the talented graduates that we call our own.

years -- we're going to make that a reality.

And here's the experience from Ohio:

90 percent of the students who have a co-op
experience get a job offer from that
company. Ninety percent of them take the
job to stay and live and work in that state.
Ohio was so committed to co-op that before
the crash, if you will, it had committed
\$50 million a year to creating 100,000 more
co-op placements.

I'm telling you, the relationship 1 between the work of our graduates in our 2 local businesses and industries, where they 3 in turn offer these young people jobs, is one of the ways to severely combat brain 5 drain. 6 Ι And every state is worried about it. 7 think we can implement some very creative solutions. Because they're not going to 9 just stay because we wish they would; we 10 have to have policies and practices in place 11 to attract and retain. 12 Thank you very ASSEMBLYMAN HAYES: 13 I appreciate your answer. 14 CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: It's a good 15 question. Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you. 17 Senator. 18 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Yes, we're joined 19 by Senator Velmanette Montgomery. 20 Senator Krueger. 2.1 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you, 22 Chancellor. I'm still trying to get my arms 23 around this differential tuition, in program 24

and campus. And I'm not making a judgment.

I'm trying to understand this. So you might have different tuition within different programs within colleges; you might have different tuition at different campuses.

So what is the campus of the SUNY system that has right now the least competitive application rate? Just to use an example. Where do you have the lowest number of applicants per acceptance?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: You know, I don't know the answer to that. I do know that, you know, the balance is over here, 35,000 applicants for 3500 seats. You know that from Binghamton and some of our other campuses. But I don't know the lowest rejection rate. That's really what you're asking.

Although I do know, of course, that our community colleges and most of our comprehensive colleges have wide access to their programs.

SENATOR KRUEGER: Then I will use -I'll call it Campus A, okay, has the

highest, the greatest number of applicants trying to get in, and Campus Z, just to be alphabetical, has the lowest. Is there a correlation now between A and Z as to where the poorest students going to SUNY are? Are the poorest students proportionally going to SUNY in fact going more likely to A or Z on your range?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Do you mean poorest, Senator, by financial income?

SENATOR KRUEGER: Yes. Not grades, family income.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, I can only cite one recent study. The State University of New York has joined with about 20-plus systems across the country to attract more low-income students to their systems. This is a project that's being funded by a number of national foundations, and it precipitated a report called *Institutions of Inequality*, the claim being that our highest-profile campuses -- those with both high academic standards for admission and high rankings, even though I think Assemblywoman Glick is

right, I'm not sure about these ranking systems. But the point there was a big brouhaha about how topnotch research universities weren't serving low-income students.

1.5

1.6

Monica and I come from a high-producing research university that also had the highest number of low-income students, so I think we're personally committed to this.

The point being a year later, one of the institutions -- in fact, the one that had made the most growth in attracting low-income students to a high-ranked and high-admission- standards institution was the State University of New York.

SENATOR KRUEGER: But again, I'm asking a question within the context of the internal of the State University, not State University compared to privates around the country.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, I think the obvious answer is we have to give you those data. But we're being recognized nationally for doing it.

19

20

21

22

23

24

SENATOR KRUEGER: Good. But again, so we have A, most competitive now; Z, least competitive within the SUNY system. We have some A and some Z, greatest number of poor students to least number of poor students.

> Right. Right. CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER:

Under a differential tuition situation -- and you also stated earlier that you believe that campuses should be able to keep the tuition they earn at their campuses.

> CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Right.

Under differential SENATOR KRUEGER: tuition is it not conceivable that (A) the schools currently who have the least competitive edge within the system and perhaps the most poor students would actually end up in a much worse situation compared to the A's is your system? that's Question A. And what will we do about that?

And Question B, would you in fact make a decision to close campuses because of the outcome of the reality?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, you know what your questions suggest to me, Senator, is that we've been making tuition policy forever, for the 60-year history of SUNY, without these data, without knowing whether we have -- even though tuition has been the same, we don't tell you on a regular basis where the low-income and the high-income students are being served.

And I think what we're suggesting to you is anything -- any abuse is conceivable. But our commitment to access, along with our quality commitment, would suggest that we don't want to see a pattern where low income prohibits access to high-performing schools.

And I can also tell you in the most open-admissions environments of our community colleges, technical colleges and some of our comprehensive colleges, I have met the most remarkable, outstanding academic students that I could have imagined.

So let's let the data be our driver going forward. Because we don't make many

data-driven decisions.

Mr. Chair.

SENATOR KRUEGER: I don't disagree with you. That's why I'm asking these questions. I think we need to understand what the data shows and also what the ramifications of policy decisions could be.

For the record, my husband is a CUNY professor, so it's not SUNY, but he also, if he was here, would say he teaches some of the brightest young students, right, in the country in the CUNY system, who are by definition disproportionately low-income.

So no disagreement, our job is to make sure our public universities are there to serve everyone, and particularly to be a hand up for lowest-income New Yorkers.

so again, I don't have an opinion yet on your proposal, but I am very concerned and would like follow-up data about what some of the analysis could lead us to if SUNY moved forward with the proposal as it's laid out.

Thank you very much. Thank you,

Senator, thank CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: 1 you for your questions. 2 And I only want to reiterate that part 3 of the reset button here is a data-driven 4 5 enterprise. I have a lot of experience with 6 data dashboards, report cards. You can 7 check my record. We had a report card at 8 UC. We disaggregated data all the time to 9 see who was adversely affected by any of our policies. I have a great track record of 10 working on data systems with K-12, and I'm a 11 part of the State of New York data system. 12 13 Evidence and data are going to be our 14 friend, and I think that's a new day for all of us. 15 SENATOR KRUEGER: Thank you. 16 Thank you, Senator 17 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Krueger. 18 Assemblyman Farrell? 19 Assemblywoman CHAIRMAN FARRELL: 20 Lupardo. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN LUPARDO: I just wanted 22 to tell you that representing Binghamton 23 University in the Assembly has certainly 24

been really one of the highlights of my professional career. So I want you to thank you for the enthusiasm and the energy that you are putting into your work.

I just have one question regarding the Empowerment and Innovation Act. I assume that you view this as an integrated set of proposals. As we move forward, I would find it very helpful to know how you would prioritize those or which of those you view as most crucial in the overall plan.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Assemblywoman

Lupardo, I want to thank you and every one
of our legislators who have SUNY campuses in
your district. I was so compelled by the 54
legislators who showed up at our SUNY campus
tour this summer and pledged their
commitment, their ongoing commitment to
those campuses. And I'm very pleased that
you have found this a prideful experience.

We see the Empowerment and Innovation

Act as highly interconnected. If we were to

parse it out, it would put way too much

strain and pressure on land lease without

1	the benefit of public/private partnerships
2	and without the benefit of tuition policy.
3	So without being obdurate, you're going to
4	have a tough time getting us to pull this
5	apart, because we see it as an integrated
6	and interrelated package.
7	ASSEMBLYWOMAN LUPARDO: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Senator
9	DeFrancisco.
10	SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Thank you.
11	With all the positive things said about
12	the Public Higher Education Empowerment and
13	Innovation Act, my question is, this being
14	so good, who is against it and why?
15	CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, Senator,
16	that's a wonderful way to frame a question.
17	SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Well, the
18	answer would be good too.
19	(Laughter.)
20	CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, I'm
21	thinking about it.
22	I think against it is a pattern of
23	leadership and decision-making that has been
24	done the same way for a long period of time.

In fact, attending the 60th anniversary of SUNY in April, before I was even on the job, I heard this sort of painful history of SUNY's management and oversight that in many people's opinion has kept us from really being the massive, comprehensive, wonderful state university system that we could be.

So I think enemy number one is change.

It's very difficult.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Could you be more specific? I mean, are there groups against it and are there reasons that you've heard that you know you're going to have to overcome through your advocacy?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: So you're not going to let me just stop with people have a hard time making change.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: No. No. No. No. I've heard that enough so far.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Okay. I'll go one step further and say that we have been very busy over the last week talking to media outlets, talking to legislators like yourselves, talking to community leaders. I

am engaged in a series of very important
discussions with our union representatives
because in the past we've had a difference

4 of opinion on some of these issues.

So I think the early returns would suggest that while this is a new idea and change is hard, local communities are seeing this as in their best interest. And that was our intent.

our students, I think you're going to hear from our students, I think you're going to hear from our faculty. I hope that we can have very productive discussions with our union representatives. We're making a huge commitment to elementary and secondary education, unheard-of in SUNY's history, that we would commit ourselves to the success of our early elementary and secondary education colleagues. I think you're going to hear from them in a positive way.

Our business leaders, I'm talking to them, I think they're going to be talking to you.

F

But you're ultimately the decision-makers, and you have to reflect their enthusiasm. So I think the verdict is out, but I'm very optimistic that it's going to be positive.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: All right, I'll wait to hear from those who are opposed and the reasons why. But I appreciate that answer.

Just one other area. What always has bothered me, and I have ESF in our district, and a community college. And what's always bothered me is the ever-increasing number of adjuncts as opposed to full-time teachers.

Now, there's no magic pot of money
that's coming from the sky that's going to
make it easier to hire more full-time
faculty. But the thing that I just can't
understand for the life of me is why we
don't do more distant learning. I mean,
with the technology that's going on right
now, there's no reason that the best
chemistry professor at one university can't
provide courses that are available to

anybody at any university and people can -
at least the core courses. And if there's a

specialized area that one community college

or one four-year college has, they can -
people can go to that school for that

specialty.

But it seems to me that there's got to be a better way to save money by using the technology available today. What is your assessment of that technology now, where is it being done now, and what's on the drawing board?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, first of all, Senator, I want you to know that the balance between full-time and part-time faculty continues to be a great concern to us. And the reason we got ourselves into this position is we had the unpredictability of budgets that kept us from hiring and retaining full-time faculty.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Agreed.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: We do think that the Empowerment and Innovation Act can go a long way to solve that. Because you've also

asked questions about temporary employees and part-time employees, so I wanted to say that.

Secondly, I think there is great promise in distance learning. And I have every reason to believe that the student learning network at SUNY and particularly the work of institutions like Empire State College are really on the leading edge of technology.

But just in the last few days, I have been contacted by a foundation to run an experiment. One of the private universities in a city near us developed an airtight online course for statistics. It took them a million-plus dollars to do it, but they believe they've developed it in such a way that it does not require the kind of high maintenance that a lot of online courses require. People think it's a savings but in fact you have 24-hour contact with your students. It's an email, now Facebook, now Twitter enterprise. And it's costly.

So what this technology wants to do

with us and another major system in the country is pilot whether greater investment in fewer courses online will really create the economy we're all chasing. And I'm wide open to that opportunity.

1.0

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Chancellor, that's not what I'm talking about. I know there's packages that can be purchased.

I'm talking about with existing faculty, there's got to be some existing faculty at every campus that has come to the attention of SUNY Central that are exceptional faculty members. And if that's the case, why not provide that experience to people that are not physically sitting at that campus? Especially when I'm hearing more and more that it's more difficult to get into certain courses at certain of the SUNY schools and you've got to wait an extra semester or whatever to wait till you get a chance to do that. It just seems like it's so logical.

And so my question was not that it holds great promise or not what you're

looking into five days ago. What is the status now? And what do you have contemplated for exploring this in the future?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, I appreciate the question, Senator, and was trying to answer it by saying that we are going to build on and expand on the successes we've had.

Do I know in front of you today exactly what percentage of our courses are online?

I don't. But you know I can provide that.

But I want to say to you we have a working group already established on these kinds of innovative instructional opportunities. We're going to build on it. I agree with you, the best of the best ought to be accessible to a wider audience. We're talking a lot about what curriculum we've put online as well to make it available to a broader audience.

I believe SUNY is rolling into the 21st-century technology with gusto, and I would be glad to report on our progress.

But we have a full complement of distance 1 learning courses. Of course we can do more. 2 Can you give me SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: 3 an example of one, of one professor, an 4 exceptional professor that's now online that 5 can be accessible to other schools? 6 I will. I can't CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: 7 at the moment. But I can tell you there are 8 great programs that have multiple faculty 9 members involved. 10 But if your point is we need to broaden 11 the access of our students to these highly 12 13 qualified, superperforming and media-friendly professors, I agree with you 14 totally. 15 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Okay. 16 you'll get me some information as to what 17 the status is? 18 CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: I will. 19 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: I'd appreciate 20 it, because I ask this every year and it's 21 always something that's got great promise in 22 the future and --23 CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: I didn't know 24

I would have been ready. 1 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: You would have been ready. You'll be ready next year. 3 CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: I will. SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Okay, great. 5 Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator. CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Assemblyman CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Englebright for a few brief words. 9 ASSEMBLYMAN ENGLEBRIGHT: Thank you, 10 Mr. Chairman. 11 Chancellor, I just want to thank you 12 for coming to visit Stony Brook so very 13 early after you came to New York. It was 14 gracious, and it was heartening. And it was 15 certainly the beginning of what I hope is a 16 continuing -- and what I believe, listening 17 to you, is going to be a continuing effort 18 on your part to reach out as no chancellor 19 previously has ever done to each of the 20 campuses. 21 I've got a question on land leases. 22 I've actually sponsored two land leases, 23 both as a result of offers of very generous 24

private contributions to the State
University at Stony Brook. One has resulted
in the Wang Center for Asian Studies. The
other, now under construction, is the Simons
Math Center. So I support the concept of
appropriate public/private partnerships.

I'm concerned in that the proposed

Asset Maximization Review Board you wrote

would essentially replace the Legislature's

role, or substitute for it, and that it

would have a simple majority vote, which is

the lowest possible bar.

But more to my concern is that it would have a 45-day automatic approval provision. I think that's correct. Please tell me if I'm reading that incorrectly. And if I am reading it correctly, isn't that likely to result in more nondecisions down the road? Would there not be a tendency for automatic approvals through inaction?

And similarly, would there have to be -- to convene a meeting of the board, would that meeting have to be called by the chair? And if the governor is one of the

appointees, I'm expecting that that might be the chair. So I'm just wondering whether the Executive might actually be able to bring approvals by not having to convene or by not convening. I wonder if you could just give some insights on that.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well,

Assemblyman, first of all let me say that I

had the great privilege of visiting Stony

Brook even before I was the chancellor, with

the announcement of President Sam Stanley,

who's doing a terrific job.

ASSEMBLYMAN ENGLEBRIGHT: Yes, he is.

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: And I have been there multiple times since, and I'll be there again on February 4th when we are discussing SUNY's role in energy and sustainability. So I look forward to seeing you then.

This so-called State Maximization Asset

Board -- I wonder how we'll refer to it

months from now -- has the oversight

ability. You've suggested ways in which its

oversight could be compromised. I hope

that's not the case. That is not intended to be the case. And I guess only time will tell that we are operating aboveboard and not making executive decisions without the compelling advice of the board. Not our intent.

I understand your cautions. And as we dig deeper into the Empowerment Act, let's talk about what those conditions would be.

We support the State Maximization Asset board because we believe it's the kind of oversight and transparency that's required as we enter into more land-lease agreements.

ASSEMBLYMAN ENGLEBRIGHT: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman Quinn.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUINN: Thank you,
Chancellor, for coming this morning. And
I'll try to make it quick; I know we
probably have more people with questions.

Talking about the differential tuition concept, where do other states place on this? We can't be the only state that does this. How many states actually are allowed

_

to choose their own tuition rates within their state for the colleges?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: I think I made a reference earlier to the constraints that are pretty unique to us and three other states. So most states engage in some form of differential tuition. That has certainly been my experience at all three institutions I have served previously in Ohio and Wisconsin.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUINN: As someone from the Western New York area, with my colleague Mr. Hayes, and as we've gone through the UB 2020 plan in the last year and a half, I think we've kind of worked on this within our delegation very much so, so we know kind of the ins and outs of this probably better than most people, actually.

For most of us living in upstate New York or Western New York, wherever it may be, we have seen a dynamic change in the economy in that part of the state. Over the last 40 or 50 years we've gone from a very heavily dependent upon manufacturing type of

area. I myself represent Lackawanna, New York, at one point the home of Bethlehem Steel, who at one point dropped thousands of jobs at one time. And that type of heavy manufacturing type of mentality has gone away. We just simply don't have that type of plants anymore.

And for many cities in upstate New
York, I think that educational institutions,
whether it be a UB or Binghamton or a
smaller institution in upstate New York,
have replaced some of these manufacturing
plants as the true economic engine to that
area. And that's not just something that
happens in New York State, I think that has
happened nationwide, that educational
institutions have replaced what was at one
period of time either textile mills or
whatever they actually made in that area.

And with the change in the world economy, in the global economy, we just don't simply make as many things in this country anymore, actually making physical goods.

How do you think, in your mind, and how does this plan play into allowing -- and I guess it kind of dovetails with Mr. Hayes' comments, but as we have this changing economy how does differential tuition and this plan as a whole allow us as a state, and especially in upstate New York, to better our economic climates?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, first of all, Assemblyman Quinn, I want to compliment you and the Western delegation for your persistence.

And I would agree with you, you probably understand the economic value of the Empowerment Act about as well as anybody, and you have been champions of the potential use of tuition flexibility and differential tuition to grow particularly the University of Buffalo's ability to serve Western New York, to move its medical facilities downtown, to create the kind of science and industry and healthcare jobs that will really revitalize Western New York.

So I am confident, given everything we've said about differential tuition, that the University of Buffalo has convinced you that it will be good stewards of tuition policy and raise the revenues it needs to help downtown Buffalo and the region.

So I think you and your sort of personal testimony to the commitment of these comprehensive research universities to be cautious and fair and equitable about differential tuition, but knowing what it's going to crank into your economy, makes you sort of the poster child for the Empowerment Act. I don't want to put a lot more pressure on you, Assemblyman, but this is the story I think you're going to hear from every region of this state.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUINN: Well, let me ask us to go back to that for a second and to compare the two of them, the way the system works right now, as opposed to what we're trying to do. Why is it better to do the differential tuition? Why is it better to put this program together?

I mean, we've talked at length today about why this program is so good. But I guess for those groups and people who are saying don't do it, it's a bad idea, why is this idea, though, better than what we have

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, I think it grows a revenue stream. So does land use, so do public/private partnerships, so does the reduction in pre-audit procurement. It grows revenue for the institution that at this time the state can't possibly provide. It cranks that revenue into job growth for your community, which employs more people who pay taxes who will build the revenues of the State of New York.

It's a little bit like the joints connected one to another. It's a ripple effect. It's not going to be abused. It is not going to be overused. But it is a revenue stream we currently do not have which allows us to invest in public/private partnerships and land lease arrangements which will generate jobs of highly skilled

now?

workers who pay taxes into the state's revenue.

It's a long story, but it begins with the ability to differentiate tuition very selectively and very carefully. In the end, it will result in revenues for the state:

College-educated students, graduates earn twice what high school graduates do at the get-go, and millions of dollars more over a lifetime, and they're going to invest it in Western New York.

ASSEMBLYMAN QUINN: One last question. The chair of the Higher Education Committee in the Assembly had mentioned earlier the fact of comparing other schools in this country, North Carolina and some other ones, as opposed to SUNY schools, from the perspective of what you actually pay to go there. But we also talked, at the end of our first statements, concerning the fact that out-of-state tuition, in many of the schools the out-of-state tuition is very high.

And some of my colleagues have said --

no one here this morning -- but have said in
the past that one of the ways we could
actually kind of make up for the amount of
money that we've lost is to increase
out-of-state tuition for people who want to
go to SUNY schools. Do you think, as the

position right now to do so?

CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER:

Assemblyman, I think we're addressing the recommendation that we look at out-of-state tuition very carefully and seriously.

That's why we asked the Rockefeller

Institute to take the DiNapoli study and to build on it.

chancellor of SUNY, that we -- are we in a

Well.

What we're going to find when this report is officially presented is that for each sector within the SUNY system there may be room to grew competitively by market, there may not. Monica's point, we do not want to price ourselves out of the market. I can tell you, at a previous institution where I served, where we were allowed to raise out-of-state tuition consecutively, we

1	eventually priced ourselves out of the
2	market. Enrollment is very
3	market-sensitive.
4	So I think what we're going to find
5	from the Rockefeller study is that some of
6	our sectors have some room to grow and
7	others are right on the margin with their
8	peers out of state. It is going to be a
9	very market-sensitive program, and that's
10	what we want to present to you.
11	ASSEMBLYMAN QUINN: Thank you.
12	CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Senator?
14	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: No further
15	questions.
16	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Assemblyman
17	Miller.
18	ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER: Thank you.
19	Thank you. I have it's more of a
20	statement than a question, but having
21	listened to the testimony, I somehow feel
22	compelled.
23	And let me again by saying I have
24	always been a strong supporter of SUNY. I

-

honestly believe that what the SUNY campuses, 60 some odd dispersed throughout the state, concentrations of brain power and physical facility that could have acted as incubators for both new entrepreneurial programs -- not just because of the facility, but because the brainpower could lend its support.

SUNY has been absolutely incredible.

And yet, ever since I arrived in Albany,

SUNY has been at the short end of the stick

in every budget. Starting with Governor

Pataki, funding for SUNY started falling off

precipitously. And how you survive and how

you maintain excellence has been absolutely

a great mystery to me, but you have. And

you are to be complimented for that.

But I have some problems. And I listened to some of the things, and one of the comments made was at some of our open enrollment campuses I've seen some of the brightest people. Those brightest people would have been on those campuses whether you had open enrollment or not. I'm a

graduate of City College, and we went through open enrollment, and the quality of the graduates declined. Just like the quality of what came in went down, what went out went down.

We talk about, you know, funding. You said 47 or 48 percent of the students at our community colleges receive remedial help; 17-some-odd percent in our regular colleges. An absolute total failure of lower education to prepare people. The college system takes them on, and that's really been the problem. The money goes to lower education. They fail. Every year we give them more money. They continue to fail. And SUNY takes on the role of remediating. The real question is why. If you're not qualified to go to college, the lower education should take on that responsibility.

And so the question is, you know, with money, the more you spend, it doesn't seem the more you get. But SUNY has been a problem. SUNY doesn't get money. You said something about \$490 million cut in the last

two years, you lost 500-some-odd employees.
You're talking about if we go through this
empowerment program, you could add 2200 more
faculty and grow jobs. It seems to me that
you could only do that if either the state
turns around or you raise tuition
precipitously. And neither one of those is
about to -- well, the state is not about to
turn around.

And raising tuition precipitously does some strange things. It does not provide for access to higher education, it creates a double standard: Those who will show up and get TAP walk out of school almost loan-free; and those that, because the economics of the family was greater, can walk out of school with \$100,000 in loans.

Both students, when they walk out of college, should be equal, equally capable of applying for the job, equally capable of getting the job, equally capable of employment. But one has a \$100,000 loan and the other doesn't. There's no equality there, and that's a problem.

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But I will tell you, the question was who opposes this empowerment program. And I'm not alone. Frankly, this is I do. a state university system. It is owned by the state and the people of the State of New The question is, why is it our York. campuses don't keep the money? Because the campus doesn't own the school, the state It's a state school. The state does. contributes significantly for the upkeep of the school, the funding, the balance sheet, the accounting. It's a state entity.

I remember when the George Washington Bridge bought Teterboro Airport. How ludicrous. The people who were administering the George Washington Bridge did own it, but they spent money to buy Teterboro Airport.

This is a state institution. It's part of the state budget. And anything we do to diminish that concept of this being a state university system will in the long run create problems.

I envision, if this happens, that the

state, which currently does not adequately fund SUNY, will now have a scapegoat. After all, the campuses can raise tuition. And they already raised fees, but we don't talk about that. The campuses can raise tuition, the campuses can decide this, the campuses can decide that. If we don't give them the money, it's their fault. And I will see that where we have failed to adequately fund SUNY as a state system, now we have an excuse to do even less funding. And that is a danger.

And again, since it is a state institution, I'm not about to turn the ownership of each campus over to the president that's in charge at that particular time.

So I think that it's an extremely slippery slope. And I think that in the long run it's going to be more luck than anything else that keeps it as a state university. And the fact that we have failed to do our job in tuition -- you talk about there's no predictability in tuition.

Yeah, there's absolute predictability. When the state is having fiscal problems, we raise your tuition. Everyone knows that, it's happened on a regular basis. It's wrong, it's a hundred percent wrong, but it was predictable.

(Laughter.)

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER: And so, you know, if we can do it wrong, we will.

That's predictable.

And so, you know, I think that sometimes it's not a matter of saying, Well, since you did it wrong, you can't ever do it right, so let us do it. And then the "us" is, how much control do we have over the "us"? And as long as it's a state university, it should be controlled by the state as a whole.

Differential tuition is an interesting thing. You just told Assemblyman Quinn that, you know, the great thing about differential tuition is that it was going to increase jobs in Buffalo. Well, we've had a significant increase in enrollment every

year, and the number of jobs in New York

State declined. Now, you and I know that

it's not because we had an increase in

enrollment; there are other factors. The

economy went down the tubes. And so there

New York State makes it very clear that if you're bright enough to be in business, you should be bright enough to leave this state. Because we will tax you until you die, and it has nothing to do so with the brilliance of the students we produce in SUNY.

are other things that factor into whether

there are going to be jobs or no jobs.

And so I would say that you have to look for a different explanation for why differential tuition is going to work. It's not a guarantee that it's going to create jobs. It's not a guarantee of anything other than that campus will get more money. And then you have the problem of the student who doesn't have the money, they're going to be forced to choose the campus that costs the least.

1	And the question was raised about
2	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: You got a
3	question?
4	ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER: Yeah, there will
5	be a question at the end. At the end of
6	this, "don't you agree?"
7	(Laughter.)
8	ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER: But I haven't
9	gotten there yet.
10	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: I can save you the
11	time and tell you I don't.
12	ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER: I will cut it
13	short because I have a plane to catch.
14	But again, you know, we can't fool each
15	other and we can't simply pass the
16	responsibility on to other people. It's our
17	responsibility. And if we fail, we should
18	fix it. But my greatest fear is that if we
19	give SUNY the power that this bill talks
20	about, that it will stop being a state
21	university system, the state will reduce its
22	funding, and it's going to be every campus
23	for itself.
24	And I don't want our campuses to turn

into the airlines where, when there's a

holiday, the fare goes up, when more people

want to fly, the fare goes up, and when more

people want to attend a campus, the fare

goes up.

The Constitution of the State of New
York says that education should be free. It
says that New York State will have a free
common system of education so all of the
children of New York may be educated. And
it doesn't stop at high school, it's
open-ended. It said free. And when I went
to college, it was free. And frankly, if it
wasn't free, I wouldn't be here today.

so I thank you for your efforts, but I think that, you know, we have to revisit how much the state is willing to give away so we're no longer responsible and on the hook. And, Denny, I thank you for allowing me to go off like this, and I leave you to the rest of the hearing.

CHAIRMAN FARRELL: I had no choice.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER: Isn't that true.

(Laughter.)

Next, Assemblyman CHAIRMAN FARRELL: 1 Cusick, to close. ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Well, thank you, 3 Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank you, 4 Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to follow 5 Dr. Miller. I just want to welcome you, Chancellor, 7 and thank you for being here, and I look forward to working with you in the future. 9 Many of my colleagues up here have SUNY 10 institutions in their district. I do not, 11 in Staten Island, but I have many students 12 in Staten Island who go to SUNY schools. 13 And my questions -- I have many questions, 14 but Mr. Chairman, I will keep it to one. 15 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you. 16 ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: You're welcome. 17 My questions were about costs to the 18 families and TAP and tuition. But one 19 specific one I'd like to ask that I think is 20 related to that is currently SUNY campuses 21 have different fees at different campuses. 22 And these fees that are for core things like 23 libraries and technology, with the new 24

tuition structure, will there be an 1 elimination to the fees? 2 CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: I think --3 Assemblyman, I appreciate the question. Ι 4 think there will be more oversight of the 5 fees and more availability of fee data. have heard several people say we don't talk 7 about the fees or we're not supposed to talk 8 about the fees. You know what? Let's talk 9 about the fees and present to you the full 10 representation of what those fees are for 11 12 and what they buy. In a situation of limited funds, I 13 think that's been one way that we've tried 14 to carry on the services for our students, 15 particularly when tuition increases did not 16 come back to the institution to do what we 17 knew we needed to do for our students. 18 So I appreciate the inquiry. I think 19 we can unpack this for you, and we will. 20 VICE CHANCELLOR RIMAI: And I might 21 add that I had the --22 And I apologize, 23 ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: I'm talking about also core fees --24

1	libraries, technology. I'm not talking
2	about discretionary when it comes to parking
3	or things like that.
4	VICE CHANCELLOR RIMAI: Right. Or
5	what we call student life fees.
6	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Right.
7	VICE CHANCELLOR RIMAI: I just wanted
8	to say I had the privilege of meeting with a
9	number of the business officers for SUNY
10	institutions, and this very issue came up.
11	And what we all agreed on was that what
12	differential tuition gave us the opportunity
13	to do was to begin to start eliminating
14	those specific fees and to look at cost
15	structure in a much more comprehensive
16	fashion and make it very clear to our
17	students and their families what the bottom
18	line cost of attending a particular
19	institution will be, not just for the coming
20	year but in multiple-year increments.
21	CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Thank you.
22	ASSEMBLYMAN CUSICK: Thank you,
23	Mr. Chair.
24	CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you very
2	much, Chancellor, for being with us this
3	morning and this afternoon as well.
4	CHANCELLOR ZIMPHER: Well, thank you
5	very much. I appreciate it. Thank you very
6	much.
7	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: The next
8	presentation is CUNY.
9	Good afternoon, everyone. Our next
10	presentation is by Dr. Matthew Goldstein,
11	chancellor of City University of New York.
12	CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Thank you,
13	Chairman Kruger, Vice Chairwoman Krueger,
14	who I see has left for a moment, Chairman
15	Farrell, Senator Stavisky, Assemblywoman
16	Glick, members of the Finance, Ways and
17	Means, and Higher Education Committees,
18	staff and guests. It's a pleasure for me to
19	be here this afternoon.
20	I will try to accelerate my public
21	statement so that there is sufficient time
22	for you to ask the questions
23	CHAIRMAN KRUGER: God bless you.
24	CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: and I'll go

through there as quickly as I can.

I come to you at a time with a wonderful history at CUNY when we are experiencing our highest enrollment to date -- more than 260,000 degree-credit students, including more high-achieving students than ever before, are studying at the City University of New York. And while we know that economic hardships have driven many New Yorkers to college to acquire new skills and attain additional certification, our decade-long growth is also a manifestation of two ongoing factors.

First, the University continues to be recognized for its academic quality and has become a destination for students seeking an exemplary education. Second, students are coming to CUNY better prepared for college-level work, and we're therefore seeing better retention rates across the University.

We take pride in the increased interest in CUNY and the improved performance of our students. However, our explosion in

enrollment -- an additional 65,000 students
since 1999 -- poses serious challenges. The
need for faculty and the demands on space
are also at unprecedented levels. With our
freshmen applications for fall 2010 also
showing a double-digit increase, we expect

these demands to grow even more urgent.

1.5

2.0

2.1

At the same time, the university's commitment to quality is unwavering. The Macaulay Honors College's Class of 2013 has an average SAT score of around 1400. Our recent Brooklyn Macaulay graduate, Ryan Merola, was just named one of nine scholars nationally to be a 2011 Mitchell Scholar. And students across the CUNY campuses are also winning competitive national awards. Most recently, five CUNY students were awarded National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowships for 2009.

Hunter College was named the nation's number two "Best Value Public College for 2010" by the Princeton Review and USA Today.

Queens College and Baruch College were named to the Princeton Review's "Best Northeastern

_

_

Colleges" list. In November, Hunter College
Distinguished Lecturer Colum McCann won the
2009 National Book Award in fiction, the top
American prize for literature. And three
outstanding educators just joined the
University in 2009: Karen Gould, president
of Baruch College; Feliz Matos Rodriguez,
president of Hostos Community College; and
William Pollard, president of Medgar Evers
College.

We are also pleased to announce that based on recent actions by the national accrediting agency, we anticipate that the new CUNY School of Public Health will soon be fully accredited. It is the very first public school of public health in New York City and the only one in the country that has a focus on urban health. Two prominent scholars and medical dollars from Harvard Medical School were recently recruited and have accepted offers to the CUNY School of Public Health, distinguished scientists David Himmelstein and Steffie Woolhandler. We look forward to them joining us.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

These are only a few of the countless ways that the entire University community is working diligently to give students the best educational experience possible. Just as our citizens turn to public higher education to help them prepare for an uncertain future, so does the state depend on CUNY and SUNY to build the workforce and innovation capacity of New York. And I am delighted that Chancellor Nancy Zimpher is installed as the chancellor of the State University of New York. From the very first day that she arrived, she and I have had several conversations, usually once or twice a week. And I wish her well, and I know that she is going to have a profound impact on the future development of this great State University system.

Let me talk briefly about the budget that was presented by the Governor and give you a couple of thoughts. And here's where I will stray from my testimony -- you have it for the record -- so that I can give you my own particular sense of where I think

this budget is helpful and where I think it is deeply harmful to the University.

3

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

On the budget recommendation, the Executive Budget recommends a total of \$1.8 billion in operating aid, this reflecting a decrease of state support of about \$84 million, offset by additional funding of \$91 million for mandatory costs and collective bargaining and \$11 million from the FY 2010 tuition increase. \$11 million reflects an increase from 20 percent to 30 percent in the amount of the FY 2010 tuition increase retained by the University. And I want to talk about that in just a minute, because I think that was a paradigm shift for both the State University and the City University, and we were delighted to be part of making that happen.

A portion of the \$84 million reduction, about \$21 million, is related to across-the-board proposals to reduce salary and fringe benefit costs to be negotiated with the unions. The proposed reduction will have a very real effect on the work of

our senior colleges. Since 1999, these colleges have together welcomed almost 38,000 additional students to their campuses. That's an entire New York University, a 38,000 increase.

Our colleges remain uncompromising in their commitment to academic quality, but the fact remains that continued budget cuts, combined with growing enrollments, means a serious strain on resources and an acute need to add full-time faculty and academic support.

You may recall when I testified last year that the central theme of my administration when I became chancellor in 1999 was to rebuild the full-time faculty of the City University of New York. When I came in as chancellor, we were seeded at about 5400 full-time faculty, down from 11,000 full-time faculty in the mid-1970s. And I'm pleased to say that during this period of time we have added an additional 1700 full-time faculty to the ranks of the City University of New York, unprecedented,

I might say, within the higher education communities across the United States.

There has been much discussion in the past several hours about the Governor's proposal for the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act, which recommends a number of adjustments in the way in which the university, both SUNY and CUNY manage its affairs. Let me talk a little bit about this, because some of this is not new. Some of this I have been talking to the joint committee for several years. And let me go over some of the ideas in this budget and provide a little more texture on how some of this is going to benefit the university and how it would work.

First of all, CUNY several years ago established this new finance vehicle which we called the CUNY Compact. It was an affirmation that the City University can no longer depend on its major two supporters, meaning the State of New York and the students, through tuition. That if we were

going to have an investment vehicle, we had to have philanthropy part of the equation, we also had to have targeted enrollment management part of the equation, and that the University had to take ownership to providing good business practices in the way in which it managed its affairs.

Part of the subject of the compact was to provide a predictable set of tuition actions. And we have acted very responsibly. I used to talk about a basket of economic indicators. We talked about the Consumer Price Index, we talked about the regional HEPI. And I told this committee that the HEPI is about 150 basis points, usually, ahead of the CPI -- it is a more enriched index than the CPI -- and that we thought that a composite of that would be a good way to inform how we would structure a tuition increase.

Let's think about how the State of

New York has dealt with tuition increases,

and let me give it to you in the rawest

terms possible. We heard Assemblyman Miller

1. 1.

saying yes, in bad times the student is taxed because the state doesn't have the revenue to support the operating needs, and in good times very little happens.

But let me put it in a different context. It's about when you were born, your age. You can enter CUNY and SUNY and go four, five, or six years and not see a tuition increase at all. Why? Because the state of the economy was such that that was not needed. But if you're a student that was born a few years earlier or a few years later, because you came into more economic turmoil, you had very steep tuition increases.

We instituted tuition increases in the 1990s of 20 to 25 percent, as did SUNY. It was obscene. It is the most regressive way of taxing students to support public higher education. It has to be changed. And that's why I proposed eight years ago and since, each year, have talked to this committee about the need to have a tuition schedule that is understood by students and

understood by their families and do it in a way that the increases are gradual and that if any student, any student was prevented from matriculating as a result of that small increase, the pledge that I gave was that we would make that student whole. And we have not walked away from that pledge.

predictable way of doing tuition, we have a track record. The record is clear, the data are clear. We have never raised tuition more than a few percentage points, and we have never allowed a student to be in harm's way. We have always captured that. That is part of the Governor's proposal. The Governor's proposal, from where I sit, supports the compact. All of our mandatory costs are covered and a process of call it a rational tuition policy, a policy informed by an index, is in place.

We also support differential tuition.

And let me describe in a little more detail,
so that I think you understand, the way in
which differential tuition would work.

Largely, it's about graduate students. It's not that much about undergraduate students.

And it is about investing in those programs.

If we were to charge, for example, another \$200 for a graduate program, that incremental increase goes back to the program. And that's why the students were supporting a differential tuition on the basis of program, because they knew that the money was not being absorbed into our treasury and no one knew where it went, it was going directly back to the program, to invest in it for more faculty, for more instrumentation, for all of the things that would make those programs supportable.

So from where I sit, this is not new news. We support a rational policy for tuition. We support differential tuition on a program basis, provided those dollars go back for investment purposes.

The other part of the program that the Governor has proposed has to do with dealing with greater accountability and greater business sense in the way in which we manage

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

our business affairs. And let me explain to you some of the reasons for us. Anything over \$20,000 -- and when we go through a procurement process, we have to send out for three bids. So someone will go to a dean and say, "We need a piece of instrumentation in our laboratory, and we need it now." this conversation takes place in October. Well, do you know that because of the procurement process -- and say this piece of equipment was \$25,000 -- we may have to wait until May to get that piece of equipment. By that time the semester is over, the students that needed that equipment are gone, and they're going on to something else.

so that is part of the proposal that we are very, very supportive of. And we understand there would be a post-audit, which is good. Because there should be, there should be good government overseeing the way in which public dollars are being spent.

With respect to land use, we have

created many partnerships with business.

Our two new dorms were done on the basis of

innovation and working with private

3

developers, and as the result of those,

5

costs have come down considerably. Because

they needed something and we needed

7

something, and we were able to do the

8

arbitrage on what those delta on the costs

9

were to get the things done.

10

The new School of Public Health, which

11

the City University of New York, was done on

is going to be a dramatic new addition to

12 13

a public/private partnership. The move of

14

our social work school was done on a

15

public/private partnership.

16

more, and any regulatory burdens that can be

So CUNY has done this, needs to do it

17

lifted a bit to allow us to do more is a

18 19

good thing. That's the way that I see the

20

proposals being provided by the Governor.

21

said that I would be brief. And I promised

Let me conclude my testimony, because I

22

the chair, and he smiled and affirmed that

23

that's a good thing.

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: It's hard to get a smile.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: A smile is good.

I am deeply concerned about the community college cut. I think this is a cut that from where I sit makes absolutely no sense. You know, I live and I work in New York City. I have close connections to the financial services world. I know that world, I wouldn't say intimately, but I know it enough to understand how we got into this problem. And we got into this problem in part because banks and other financial institutions would take short-term debt, long-term debt, securitize that debt, and make it look like stocks.

Now, with stocks there are very, very real regulatory frameworks in place that do not allow for shenanigans to take place.

But when you take long-term debt and securitize it and make it look like stocks, this is where people got into tremendous problems. This was the problems with the

_

securitizing mortgages and collateralized debt obligations. All of this stuff has played havoc in New York City.

And as a result of that, we're seeing large unemployment. The latest numbers in New York, 10.6, I think that number is going to go up. It's particularly acute in parts of the state. Wall Street is going to be a very different place than it was just a few years ago, and we're not going to be able to depend on the revenue that we all expected to live by.

And people are not being able to get jobs, and they're coming to the community colleges. They're coming to the community colleges to get training. They're coming to the community colleges to compete for jobs that are there, but they don't have the skills.

To shut the door to these students at these community colleges I think is a very, very poor strategy. And I implore you to really take a look at this clearly and try to turn this around. We must keep the

community colleges at SUNY and at CUNY open for students and help expand it.

We are bursting at the seams with the community colleges. To see another \$285 reduction in base aid over the \$130 base aid reduction that was implemented last year will have a chilling effect on the university. And we cannot permit that to happen. It doesn't make sense.

As we look how to unwind from this recession that we have been in that largely was the result of poor practices and high risk, yes, in the financial services world -- and it affects New York in a very profound way -- we have to keep these community colleges open. So I ask that you pay particular attention to that.

And the last thing that I would talk about -- and again, deviating from my text -- is the capital program. Capital creates jobs. We have facilities now that are completely designed, and they're ready to start construction. And there are people who have the skills ready to build these

E

buildings that we desperately need at theCity University of New York.

We don't have land, unfortunately. Ι wish we had land in the five boroughs. Wе don't. So what we have to do is to refurbish and build facilities from old facilities to use them in a much more efficient way. And if we are talking about creating jobs and helping the University to work with the state to enhance its very poor balance sheet -- and all of you know New York State has a very poor balance sheet -we must look at our capital program as one area in which the university can, through its needs, help to create an environment that we think will be helpful.

Mr. Chairman, I will stop at that particular time -- I pledged to you I would do it -- and I'll take any questions that any of you would like to provide.

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you, Chancellor.

The first question is by the chair of the Higher Education Committee, Toby

3

5

6

7

Ø

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Stavisky.

SENATOR STAVISKY: Thank you. Thank you, Chancellor. In fact, your comments particularly on the community colleges, I just set aside the questions I was going to ask about it, about the reductions in base aid and TAP and so on, because I think your statement is a very strong one and I happen to agree with you completely.

A couple of real quick questions based upon your testimony today. The Governor proposed a cap on out-of-state students.

Now, I know the out-of-state students at CUNY, in large part many of them are foreign students. And I represent an immigrant community, as much of the City of New York is an immigrant community.

What's going to be the effect of this cap on foreign and out-of-state students?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: You know, our country was built on the backs of immigrants. I think all of our parents or grandparents came here from another country. And thankfully they arrived on our shores

and they created great music, great science, they became some of the most profound people in commerce and finance. And if we had cut the ability of these people to come and study here, I don't know that we would be the country that we are today.

So when you ask me what is the effect of putting a cap on our students from out of state, which are largely immigrant students, I think the effect, derived from our own experience in the past, is going to be the same thing. There are people that will no longer have the ability to study at this university and no longer be able to not only improve their lives but improve the lives of their community. That's where I see the problem.

SENATOR STAVISKY: And in fact when City College was founded in the 1840s, the objective was to educate the sons and daughters of -- sons, primarily, at that time -- of immigrants. And it seems to me that mission really hasn't changed.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: That's what we

1.1

do.

SENATOR STAVISKY: A couple of other questions. You spoke about having differential tuition for certain subject areas, certain programs that may be more expensive to administer. And I assume we're referring to programs with labs and so on, the so-called stem subjects.

Is this going to intensify the existing stratification by gender or by economic income or by race that could exist?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Senator

Stavisky, let me again -- first of all, the answer is unequivocally no.

The reason that I am supporting this and have been supporting it for a long time is that I think we need an investment vehicle for very-high-priced programs.

Let me give you an example of what I'm talking about. When I was president of the Baruch College, as I was leaving the campus -- and I had a wonderful seven years as president there -- I started a program, it's either a master of science or a master

of arts, I forget what the degree is, in financial engineering, the so-called quants. And in my previous life I used to train a lot of those people, so I know that world. And maybe we can be blamed for some of the problems that we're facing.

But the fact is that those students

leave with jobs, and they are getting jobs

north of \$100,000 a year. It's a highly

competent program. NYU has a very strong

program, Columbia has a very strong program,

Baruch College has a very strong program.

But because it is a master's of arts or a

master's of science, we are restricted from

charging a tuition compared to any other

master of arts or master of science program.

So I have a group of students that are taking a master of arts in philosophy and a another group of students taking a master of arts in fine arts and another group of students taking a master of arts in financial engineering. And because this program is so in demand, and because these students leave with great jobs, and because

I can use the money to invest in that

particular program, why not do it?

The students even say to me: "We'll support this, but show us where the money is going." And my pledge to all of you is that it's not going to be absorbed into the treasury, where there's no audit of where those dollars go. It goes right to the program where we're creating the levy. And that's how I conceive of differential tuition by program. And that's where I think it is a good thing for CUNY.

with differential tuition by college. In Queens County we have Queens College and we have York College. And I am troubled that if we initiate or if we have a program where Queens College can charge more than York College, that we're going to put York College in jeopardy.

How do you feel about that?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: For CUNY, it's a nonstarter. I don't support differential tuition by campus. It doesn't make sense

1	for CUNY, because we are a tightly compacted
2	university living in each other's back yard
3	with a lot of flows back and forth.
4	SUNY is a different situation. SUNY is
5	much more spread out, has much more variance
6	in the kind of institutions. And there you
7	heard from Chancellor Zimpher being
8	supportive of that.
9	But for us, when I think about
10	differential tuition, it's on a program
11	basis, largely, largely weighted towards
12	graduate education. And it probably is just
13	going to be in a few areas. But I need that
14	ability to make investments into those
15	programs.
16	SENATOR STAVISKY: Even though the
17	Governor has tried to eliminate graduate
18	TAP.
19	CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry?
20	SENATOR STAVISKY: I said "and the
21	Governor is trying to eliminate graduate
22	TAP."
23	CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, I
24	SENATOR STAVISKY: No, that's not a

1 question.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, I am not supportive of eliminating graduate TAP.

SENATOR STAVISKY: Two quick ones.

Last year I visited the ASAP program in Queensborough Community College, which is in my district. And I'm very proud of Queensborough; they have a wonderful program for high school students. How can that program be replicated? I think there's six campuses, but --

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Let me tell you about ASAP. It derived from a night when I was walking in my apartment at 2:30 in the morning -- it's absolutely a true story -- where I was lamenting about the very poor graduation rates at community colleges around the United States.

The three-year graduation rates
nationally at community colleges are about
25 percent. That means that one out of four
students that are enrolled in a two-year
program graduate in three years. And there
are lots of reasons for that -- and a lot of

very good reasons and a lot of lousy reasons.

And I tried to conceptualize, not knowing as much about community colleges because I never studied at a community college, I never taught at a community college. But community colleges are the acid class in higher education that is exploding in size. Forty-five percent of the students studying in the United States today study at a community college. They are the point of entry.

And I wanted to think about how we could create a program. And I had breakfast with Michael Bloomberg, our mayor, and I said to him, "I have an idea, and I'd like to test it out. Would you support it?" And he said yes. And we supported -- and let me give you the data.

We will graduate a cohort of
students -- we started at about 1200
students, and it was started at each of our
six community colleges. We will graduate
60 percent of those students in three years

in the ASAP. Now, if that isn't a paradigm shift, I don't know what is.

3

4

5

8

9

10

1 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, it requires an investment. Ι don't want you to leave here thinking this is just business as usual. It was an investment but a well-thought-out program. And from that ASAP, we are now conceiving a new community college: Totally redesigned, derived from the principles that the ASAP program was built upon. And we're hoping -and tomorrow I'll be in Washington speaking with Under Secretary of Education Kanter, who is very interested in our new idea. The Gates Foundation has pumped in a lot of money into this idea. And I'm hoping that we can push forward using this as a model as a reform in how community colleges are engaging with students in ways different than they're engaging with students right now.

SENATOR STAVISKY: I must tell you, when I had the call from President Marti and he was so excited that I should come over, drop everything, come over and look at the

program. And I left with the same feeling 1 of excitement, that this has great 2 potential. 3 Last question, which I think is sort of 4 the summary of the other questions as they 5 involve community colleges. I find it very 6 upsetting -- and I attended a meeting of the Education Commissioners of the States where 9 this was an issue -- that 75 percent of our students in the CUNY community colleges --10 or 73.7, I think, percent of the students in 1.1 the CUNY community colleges need 12 remediation, whether it be reading, writing 13 14 or math. That the skills they bring are so limited that they have to satisfy these 1.5 requirements before they can continue. 16 What can we do? To tell me that, well, 17 a couple of years ago it was 85 percent 18 doesn't make any me feel any better. 19 CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Oh, it doesn't 20 make anybody feel better. I don't want to 21 spend --22 What can we do? SENATOR STAVISKY: 23

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN:

24

I don't want

,

to spend money on remediating students. But this is a national problem. This is not a problem unique to New York State, it is ubiquitous across the United States.

And the United States really -- it's really after World War II that community colleges were really first conceived. It was rare to find a community college before World War II. So it's really an American phenomenon.

We need to do a better job in preparing students to come to a university, whether it's a two-year college or a baccalaureate institution. Too many of our students, unfortunately, are leaving schools poorly educated, and some of them are severely poorly educated. And it troubles all of us greatly.

And that is one of the reasons that in our administration we have spent as much time developing relationships with the DOE schools. And Joel Klein and I now have groups that are working, a group with SUNY and a group with the

DOE to drill down deep into the bedrock of 1 the experiences that students have at our high schools and junior high schools, and 3 working with the teachers so that they understand the expectations of faculty at 5 universities and better prepare them. It's going to take a long time, but this is something that we must do. Community colleges as part of their overall mission remediate the deficiencies that 10 should have been dealt with in earlier 11 stages of their education. 12 SENATOR STAVISKY: Thank you, 13 Chancellor. And thank you for the 14 leadership that you have been providing over 15 the last 11 years, since 1999. 1.6 CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 Mr. Chairman, I neglected to introduce 19 part of my leadership team here, if you 20 would let me do that. 21 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Please. 22 CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: All the way on 23 my left is Pete Jordan, who handles student 24

affairs at the university. 1 Marc Shaw, who's recently joined us as senior vice chancellor for budget, finance 3 and financial policy is right here; we're delighted to have Marc. 5 Iris Weinshall, who does magic with our real estate and has unclogged the pipeline 7 of lots of projects -- and that's why we need more money, because she needs to be 9 She does it well. fed. 10 And everyone knows Jay Hershenson, our 11 senior vice chancellor, who handles our 12 government relations and is our top 13 communication officer. And he's also 14 secretary to the Board of Trustees. 15 So thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you. 17 We are joined, once again, by Senator 18 DeFrancisco as well as Senator Brian Foley. 19 CHAIRMAN FARRELL: Deborah Glick, to 20 question. 21 ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Nice to see 22 you, Chancellor. I will try to be as 23 succinct as you were in your opening

statement, with a few different areas.

Earlier I asked Chancellor Zimpher about outside contracts to do what might be services that appear to be normal CUNY services. The example I gave was the handling of transcripts, if somebody for whatever reason needs transcripts. And it turned out that in at least one of the schools they thought they were dealing with SUNY and they were actually dealing with some Chicago firm that had screwed up.

So I'm wondering if there are those kinds of services that the university contracts with and whether those contracts are in or out of state. And I don't necessarily expect you to have that off the top of your head. It is one of those areas --

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, I would assume the answer is yes but I don't think ubiquitous at all in the university.

The one that comes to mind, and we do this at a couple of our campuses, is some of the custodial staff, staffs that we have

where we will contract out for services to

clean and maintain a building or a set of

buildings, as opposed to having -- which is

most of the cases at our campuses -- people

that are employees of the City University of

New York and do the same thing.

We also have had some involvement with outside security on a couple of our campuses.

I would think that those would be the dominant areas of contracting. There probably are other very small things that we do, and I can certainly get a compilation of them. I don't see this as a big issue for us, but I can certainly compile that and get that to you forthrightly.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Ancillary to that is whether there is a large use of temporary workers.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, if you define temporary workers as part-time workers, we have lots of those people on our faculty. For example, we have about 9500, maybe close to 10,000 faculty who are

adjunct faculty who are not part of the full-time teaching corps of the university, and we rely on them for coverage of, obviously, many of our classes.

And that probably would be the biggest area that we have, certainly in the instructional area of the university. And of course we hire people part-time, administrative assistants and people like that. But most of our employees are full-time people.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: In the area of support, we don't have to go back over those things that are very clear about the compact. The only thing is that I always understand the notion of the compact as being a consistent or knowable state commitment. And I guess I'm asking whether or not you think that this budget reflects in any way what you had anticipated in terms of the reduction.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, this is not a good budget for CUNY. Let me just mention that just straightforward. An

\$84 million cut, for me, translates to about 1 850 full-time faculty. So, you know, take that number -- and that's full boat. That's 3 with salary, fringe benefits. That's a

> If we have that built into our base, I would open up the gauntlet and -- open up the -- not the gauntlet, the faucet -- the spigot, thank you, Iris -- the spigot and have a flow of --

significant number of full-time faculty.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: I thought Jay did communication. Just joking.

(Laughter.)

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, if Iris had not given it to me, Jay would have been there immediately.

Eight hundred fifty full-time faculty is a big deal for us, and that's what a cut of that nature is. So don't leave here thinking that this is a walk in the sun for It's not at all. And it comes on top us. of previous cuts. And there's just so much that you can stress the system where it's not going to have a very chilling effect.

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So yes, the budget cuts are real, and they have been continuous. And that is one of the reasons that I think we need to operate in a different way.

We will always be a state institution.

And I think, you know, the movement of public higher education to emulate private universities is not a good thing.

Eighty percent of the students who study in the United States study at public universities. And that's where the action is, and that's where the action will continue to be. And that's where I think it's critically important to preserve and protect our public universities.

You know, two years ago, right before

President Obama was elected, we brought to

New York City some of the top leaders in

public higher education. And we're going to

do it again, we're going to do it in

October. And I'd love -- and Jay already is

thinking about how to engage communities

outside of the universities to participate

in that discussion.

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We are facing peril in the United States. And I have said this to this committee -- and some of you raised your eyebrows when I said it -- I think we're facing a national security problem if we don't support public higher education in the United States. Because if we don't educate our people so that when they leave they can compete in an economic environment that is totally unforgiving on two levels, skills and competition, the United States is going to be diminished as a country. We cannot afford -- it's not that we're going to be attacked, but we're going to be comprised economically, and we cannot afford to do that.

So when I see the chipping away at CUNY
I worry that we're going to be able to give
our students the best experience we are
capable of. And yes, we have raised a lot
of private money. In 2005 we announced a
\$1.2 billion campaign. We got it done four
years earlier. We're now going to do a
\$3 billion campaign. We have to do that.

But that doesn't mean we're going to emulate a private university.

I am obligated, as the chancellor of this university, to find dollars to support the educational life of our students. And if I can't get it fully from the state, which is where I need to get it from, I need to fill in the holes in other ways. That's what the CUNY Compact was about. And that's why I refer to it as a financing vehicle. It's a financing vehicle for investment. It's not about supporting the operating needs of the university.

So back to your question, what the Governor has proposed is covering our mandatory costs. That's critically important for us. If you don't have your mandatory costs, you cannot do the compact. What we need, in addition to the mandatory costs, we fill in the rests of the blanks. I need to have gradual tuition imposed, and I need to have some of that money returned to the campus.

And that's why two years ago we were

successful, with your help and with the help of DOB, to get 20 cents on the dollar returned every time we levy tuition. This year it's 30 percent. And hopefully the law will continue to live so that next year it will be 40 percent. To me, that was a major -- and I think I used the term "paradigm shift." That was important for us.

And so when you say does the budget provide, if it would provide an opportunity for us to do gradual tuition increases -and when I say gradual, look at our record. Two percent this year, 3 percent, 4 percent. That is the order of magnitude that we're talking about. If we can get that and our mandatory costs, then our presidents are going to support the philanthropy piece and our management teams are going to support the efficiencies and productivities that we can monetize and put back into the system to spend money and managing our enrollment in ways that will generate resources. That's the idea.

1

2

3

4

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Thank you.

2

As your enrollment has been growing, as

3

your enrollment has grown, are you also seeing greater demand for programs like

4 5

And if so, how are you managing that? SEEK?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Our SEEK

7

program has been very stable. You did say

SEEK? Yeah, our SEEK program has been very

9

stable over the last several years, and the

10

SEEK students are doing much better.

11

Retention is higher, graduation rates are

12

higher, and the program continues to serve

13

an important need at the university. And we

At some of the

14

watch it very carefully.

15

schools -- and I couldn't agree more that 16

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK:

17

the community colleges are a critical

18

gateway. But they are bursting at the

19

They're doing creative things like,

20

you know, doing weekends at campuses that have some space available, maybe reducing

21 22

some of the travel time for some students,

23

and doing all sorts of things.

24

How close is the university to not

being able to accommodate any more students?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: We are, to use a tired phrase and a beaten-up phrase, we're bursting at the seams. You go to any of our community colleges, they are operating seven days a week. Get there at 7, 8 o'clock in the morning, you will see classes. Stay until 10, 11 o'clock at night, you will see classes.

About a year ago, Jay Hershenson -- and I just refer to him as Jay, because everybody knows Jay -- Jay said to me, "You know, we ought to think about a 24-hour campus." And I said, "What are you, crazy? We'll never be able to clean the campus and so forth."

I think he's right. We are seeing more and more people so desperate to get classes and so challenged by the complexity of their lives that they are willing to come to the university at ungodly hours. The students are so motivated that we may indeed turn out to be a campus for many of our community colleges that will emulate almost

24-hour-a-day experience. We're not there yet, but we're getting pretty close.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: I think you touched on this, and it follows up on what Senator Stavisky was talking about.

There seems to be a growing disconnect between the view of high school instructors as to what is making somebody college-ready and college instructors as to what is in fact the level of achievement of the incoming students. And some of that seems to be linked to a disconnect in curriculum, that there hasn't been the kind of change or innovation in curricula in the high schools and it's translating into students coming in without sufficient background in some areas. And I will discuss this also with Dr. Steiner when he's available.

But from the public schools in New York
City, which is the largest influx of your
student body, the figure I saw was that
70 percent of students -- and I don't know
if entering just the community colleges or
not -- were in need of some level of

remediation. A, is that accurate? And B, what do you think CUNY can do, working with DOE, to make the adjustments necessary to improve the potential for success?

And it sounds like some of it has to do with the way in which this particular program that you're focused on -- as you said, it took money -- took focus. But is there in fact -- from literature I'm reading, there appears to be some disconnect on just even the curricular basis.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: There has been a disconnect, I think throughout the United States, that universities have not spent enough time thinking about schools. Really the place in the university that typically did think about schools -- that's K-12 -- were the education schools, because that was part of their life.

You're right that about 75 percent of the students that come to our community colleges need to be remediated in at least one area -- writing, comprehension, or mathematics. And that number is much lower

_

than it was a few years ago, but it is still appallingly high and unacceptable.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We are working and have been working, I think CUNY really has taken a lead in the United States -- and it preceded me coming I'm not at all taking credit for this. We've just built on it -- really taking these silos that existed, CUNY and the DOE schools, and breaking the boundaries that separated those silos. Faculty are talking with one another. We're sharing data in ways that we've never shared data before, to really understand the data, to inform how we can communicate to teachers, parents and students at the schools what the expectation is when they enter a university, whether it's CUNY or someplace else.

We have a long way to go, because the issues are deep and complex. But I think we are obligated to do that because we want our students to be successful. And with low graduation rates or low retention rates, a good part of the variance that explains that is very poor preparation. And we've got to

get our hands around that.

And, you know, we train a lot of the teachers. SUNY trains a lot of the teachers that teach not only in the DOE schools but across the state. We have to do a better job. The university has to do a better job, and certainly the schools have to do a better job of communicating and not being fearful of the discussion. And there was fear about, you know, really showing the warts. And we have to get that off the screen and be truthful to one another and really try to help us. And we're really doing it in ways that we've never done it as much before.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Let me just ask one last question about where you are on capital needs and what the budget means to you in that regard. There is some continuation for critical maintenance, but as old as the SUNY schools are, many of the CUNY schools are even older.

So what the current situation in terms of dealing with the problems that exist in

many of the classrooms where maybe there are 1 leaks, maybe there are windows that don't open or windows that never opened or rain 3 inside when it rains outside? Those kinds of things that make it difficult for 5 students and faculty to focus on what is really the business at hand. 7 CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: I think Iris Weinshall can answer it with much greater 9 10 depth and knowledge. ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: I expect it 11 from Iris. 12 CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Iris 13 14 Weinshall, she can do it better. One of the things I will say is that we 1:5 worked with SUNY a few years ago to develop 16 a plan of what the critical maintenance 17 needs are for both SUNY and CUNY. And we 18 are delighted that this year, as last year, 19 we do have in our capital budget about 20 285 -- well, that's close, 284 is pretty 21 close to 285 -- \$284 million for critical 22 maintenance at our senior colleges. 23 So why don't you take it from there,

Iris?

VICE CHANCELLOR WEINSHALL: The chancellor is correct. This is the third year that DOB will be funding our critical maintenance program. To date, we've committed well over \$200 million of the \$560 million that was appropriated in the last couple of years. So we're putting that money to work.

But clearly many of our buildings are well over 30 years old, and they have many different operations that don't work correctly. And you're right, you know, we've got roofing problems, we've got window problems, elevator/escalator problems. But with this money, we're able to address those needs.

Let me just reiterate what the chancellor said also. Beyond the critical maintenance, there are a number of projects which we call shovel-ready. They're fully designed and ready to go into construction. And we have appropriations for those projects, but a little more money needs to

be added so that we can complete those 1 projects. 2 And so as the budget process proceeds, 3 we're going to be coming by with our 4 priority list. And if we can get this 5 funding, that those projects can go into the ground and start construction. 7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Do you have a figure that we'll be hearing about? 9 VICE CHANCELLOR WEINSHALL: Not a 10 figure, but we'll be coming around with a 1 1 number of projects. 12 13 ASSEMBLYWOMAN GLICK: Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN KRUGER: Thank you. I'm just going to slide in here for a moment, 15 Chancellor. 16 When we talk about the issue of tuition 17 differential, we get into a gray area. 18 Sophie Davis, for example, it's a hybrid 19 kind of a program. It's an undergraduate 20 program, yet it takes the form of a graduate 21 program. What is the tuition policy in a 22 situation like that? 23 CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: What was the 24

1 program?

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: The Sophie Davis Biomed.

Davis School of -- which is a great program, you know. Yeah, for those of you who may not be aware of this, this is a seven-year program where students are admitted right from high school, they attend City College, and at the end of five years they get their undergraduate education in the first two years of medical education, the biomedical piece, and then they finish the last two years in a clinic setting at Mt. Sinai or P&S or Downstate or one of those institutions.

That would be something we would -- how we would differentiate the tuition for a hybrid like that, which I believe is unique in the university, would take some thought.

And, you know, I can't give you an answer right now, but I'd be happy to communicate to you what our thinking would be if we had the ability to do that.

-

CHAIRMAN KRUGER: As you point out, a great program, designed around a ghetto medicine model. And to take kids out of high school and to put them into a position where if they did qualify -- and it has become much more competitive through the years, as it should be. It would be a departure from the mission of the program itself if we created an artificial firewall, so to speak, that would make it difficult if not impossible for many deserving kids to participate in it.

Okay. Senator Montgomery?

SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you,
Mr. President. Am I on? Okay, thank you.

Chancellor, thank you. And I certainly agree with a couple of your statements. In particular, one is that I think you're absolutely right that the lack of access to higher education for so many young people, and young people who are being poorly educated, is a homeland security threat. So I'm glad you mentioned that.

And you mentioned that you will be

having a second summit for higher education 1 professionals at some time. And I'm assuming that you will specifically include 3 in that summit some of the presidents of the HBCUs who have been apparently more 5 successful in the development of young people, particularly African-American young 7 people. I'd just like to ask you about the BMI 9 program. I know that you have instituted 10 this specifically to try and reach the most 11 difficult sector of our student population, 12 and that's young males of color. So I'm 13 just curious to know what number of students 14 you've been able to reach and what's the 15 success of that program vis-a-vis the number 16 of students who have been able to move 17 through the system based on the BMI program. 18 CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: The BMI 19 program is --20 Black Male SENATOR MONTGOMERY: 21 Initiative. 22 -- the Black CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: 23 Male Initiative. It was started a few years 24

_

_

ago, derived from the very good work of
Edison Jackson with the Male Empowerment
Program he had at Medgar Evers College. I
then thought about it and wanted to scale it
up at the university level.

We're privileged to have recruited
Elliott Dawes, who is the fellow who is our
guiding light now in the Black Male
Initiative. And this year his major focus
was around health careers and problems of
health mainly in urban areas. And he worked
very closely with Ken Olden, who we
recruited as our founding dean of the CUNY
School of Public Health. Ken we recruited
from the National Institutes of Health,
where he headed up a very important
directorate.

So in short, the BMI is alive and well.

Many students are going through the various programs that we have at the various campuses. I would ask Pete Jordan, our vice chancellor for student affairs, to put a little more texture on it. But that's the overall look at the program from 10,000 feet

up. Pete can give you more detail.

_

Montgomery, thank you for inquiring the program because it is one of the programs in recent years that the university has started that we are especially proud of. Currently, across the university there are approximately 17 different programs going on that include structured mentorship for approximately 3,000 young men who are largely of African and Latino descent across the university.

We are also privileged to have the support of private corporations and foundations, like Deutsche Bank as well as the Schott Foundation, in terms of working with us and contributing to the support of this program. Over the last two years, those two organizations contributed over \$750,000 to the support of this program. So we're really proud of the program.

In addition to the health career focus that the chancellor mentioned, there is also a focus on assisting young African-American

and Latino men in terms of entry into the legal profession, into law schools, as well as a focus on medical school and the teaching professions as well.

So it's a signature program that we're really proud of, and it has so far proven to assist young men, urban males, in terms of staying in school and staying focused, creating community as well.

SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you. If I could just pursue that. You indicate that there's \$750,000 that you received in private foundation funding. What about the university funding itself? Do we have a budget for that internally, or how does that work? And does it relate at all to the ASAP program, or these are entirely different kinds of programs.

VICE CHANCELLOR JORDAN: The ASAP program is different, although students who are enrolled in the ASAP program can participate in also mentorship programs through the BMI program.

I neglected to point out that and to

thank the City Council of New York for its
support of the program as well. There, we
have received an average of \$2 million a
year for the last five years in support of
this program. And of course the university
is also contributing through in-kind support

in terms of staffing and so forth.

SENATOR MONTGOMERY: All right. So I guess I was anticipating that the BMI program would be a little bit more than mentoring. So I'm happy with the mentoring, but I thought we needed a lot more support, a deeper support in order to make it really possible to reach some of the young people who are most difficult to reach.

So I'm not clear about what the intent of it is, and I guess I was mistaken in my understanding of what the purpose of the Black Male Initiative was.

VICE CHANCELLOR JORDAN: Senator

Montgomery, you're not mistaken. Pardon my

poor representation, perhaps, of the program

in identifying just one aspect of the

program.

1 But overall, the focus of the program addresses access issues for students. 3 for students who are enrolled, it's also about providing them with structure, the 5 kind of structure, counseling, academic counseling and support that is needed, as 7 well as career development and support for these students. And career -- not only 9 career, but financial literacy development as well. 10 So there are a whole host of services 11 12 and developmental opportunities that are provided for students in the program, and 13 14 mentoring is one aspect of that. 15 SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Okay, thank you. 16 It would be helpful if I could see where 17 those programs are and just what exactly goes into making them unique in terms of 18 19 their attempt to build a support for these 20 difficult young people. CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: We'll be happy 21 22 to provide that for you. 23 VICE CHANCELLOR JORDAN: Definitely.

SENATOR MONTGOMERY:

24

Thank you.

appreciate that.

I want to just raise another kind of issue -- related, but not exactly the same -- and that is that some of campuses have college-campus high schools, and obviously apparently they are very successful. I'm just wondering to what extent you view that as something that should be systemwide and how could we support that happening more.

And related to that, apparently many of the young people, especially the ones that we're talking about, the BMI group and others who have difficulty, start to really fall out in their middle-school years. And so I'm wondering if there is any thought about a more intense intervention for middle-school-age young people.

And I know that's not your purview, not your responsibility, but neither is high school, and you've done a good job by taking on a piece of that. And I would just wonder if there is any thought or any possibility of planning to reach down to middle school.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, we do.

I think probably the best example of that is our College Now program. College Now goes down as low as eighth or ninth grade. So that -- you know, those are middle-school youngsters. And we work very effectively with them.

With respect to the high schools, we have, I believe, about 18 high schools now that we take ownership with, and they are either on or contiguous to a CUNY campus. And on the books, we have some additional high schools, these early-college high schools in particular, that we will be taking responsibility for. And those schools are some of the best-performing schools in New York City.

SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Yes, I appreciate that. Thank you.

And I have two more questions, quick.

One is I always hear that the students are failing. So we measure success or we refer to the success or failure of the students.

And I contend that the students cannot be

more successful than the level of expertise of the adults in the system.

So my question is, then, since there is obviously a relationship between the preparation of teachers and the success or failure of large numbers of young people, especially in public school -- before they get to you -- what are we doing to improve the quality of professional preparation? So that we don't have teachers who are not actually prepared to go into a classroom, especially into classrooms where there are any number of issues that they have to deal with. What's happening with that?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: We are fortunate to have David Steiner as the new commissioner of Education. David derives from Hunter College, where he was considered one of the leading deans of education at the City University of New York. And so we were delighted that David ascended to the position of commissioner at SED.

He, among many things that he has to do, is going to officiate over a reformation

of the way in which we train teachers. And Nancy Zimpher and I have met with David on several occasions, and with Meryl Tisch and other members of the Regents, to talk about a rethinking of how we train teachers. You know, emulating a much more clinical model.

Nancy Zimpher is much more of an expert in teacher education than I am, but I'm certainly participating in those discussions as well with our faculties. And a lot of the "Race to the Top" programs that are -- we went through iteration one, but iteration two I think will be very much dominated by about the way in which we treat teachers and how do we create a much more clinical kind of an experience to really see teachers being trained in ways to address just the kinds of issues that you're talking about.

SENATOR MONTGOMERY: And I fully support the new commissioner in his philosophy, and certainly I look forward to working to support him, continuing to support him as he seeks to upgrade our teacher training institutionally based.

I just want to mention one last thing, and that is Medgar Evers College. I want to commend you and the trustees for a wonderful new president. I've met with president Pollard, and I have expressed to him and he has expressed also his desire to have Medgar Evers continue to be an extremely important

college it is really so much more.

And so I will be looking forward to when he presents to us -- and I mean "us" broadly, as the representatives of that college, in that borough -- his plan. But also we will be bringing to him many of the issues that are not specifically college but are related to the quality of life in so many areas and the needs in that borough, especially in the northern part of Brooklyn.

asset to the community, so it's not just a

So I am sure he is going to need a lot more support, especially in -- both in academic areas but also just in community-support needs areas. So I look forward to us working with you on that.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Senator

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Montgomery, I am very much responsible for putting search committees together for presidents, and I also spend a lot of my time going to every interview. And when I heard Bill Pollard during his interview, I had a little thought that said, This is going to be the next president at Medgar Evers. Because he said something to me that really resonated deeply. He said: "My task is focused primarily upon student success." And he spoke eloquently at his interview about that, and that has been his focus.

He's new to the institution, he's only been there for a few months, but he's assembling a first-rate management team. And with a brand-new facility coming on board at Medgar Evers, I think Medgar Evers has a brilliant future with a wonderful new president that has a lot of energy and good ideas, and certainly working very closely with the people here at this table and other members of the administration.

> SENATOR MONTGOMERY: Thank you. Assemblyman

CHAIRMAN FARRELL: 24

Charles Lavine.

2

Thank you,

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ASSEMBLYMAN LAVINE: Chairman Farrell.

Chancellor, yesterday I was reading someone's bio, and in the bio -- it was a political bio -- the fellow wrote that he took great pride in the fact that he had received a first-rate education at blank private college, which we would all know if I mentioned it.

And I resented that a little bit -more than a little bit, as someone who thinks he got a first-rate education at a public university. So all the more reason, on behalf of the 80 percent of us who rely on public institutions of higher education, all the more reason to commend you and your team for fighting so hard for public education even in difficult economic times.

Now, I've got a couple of brief questions for you and then an observation.

First, what is your view about the Governor's budget proposal to reduce TAP for financially independent married students?